ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT IN NEW BRUNSWICK
ÉTUDE D'IMPACT ENVIRONNEMENTAL AU NOUVEAU-BRUNSWICK

Transcript of the public meeting held to discuss the Environmental Impact Assessment Report on the proposal by N.B. Power to construct and operate a 400 MW combustion turbine generating station at Millbank, N.B.

Compte-rendu de l'audience publique organisée pour discuter de l'Étude d'impact environnemental de la proposition faite par Énergie NB de construire et d'exploiter une centrale à turbines à combustion de 400 MW à Millbank

Prepared by the N. B. Department of the Environment
Rapport rédigé par le ministère de l'Environnement du N.-B.

September 25, 1990
Le 25 septembre 1990

ANGELA BIRDSELL

I would like to call the meeting to order. J'appelle la réunion à l'ordre. Mesdames et messieurs, ladies and gentlemen: welcome to tonight's public meeting. My name is Angela Birdsell and I have been asked to chair this meeting. I am neither affiliated with or employed by the proponent, N.B. Power, or the Provincial Department of Environment. My role here this evening is to ensure that everyone who wishes to make comments or ask questions has an opportunity to do so.

As you know, we are here tonight to discuss results of the environmental impact assessment of the proposed turbine generating station a Millbank. The report was prepared by consultants for N.B. Power, which proposes to build a four hundred megawatt generating station at Millbank. The full EIA report has been available for public review at various locations in the Millbank, Chatham and Newcastle areas.

The public has also had access to a general review statement, which was prepared by a committee of federal and provincial representatives who conducted an evaluation of the EIA report. In addition the department of the environment produced a summary of the EIA report outlining the main point covered in the assessment. If anyone has not had an opportunity to look at these documents they're available here this evening at the table near the entrance.

Now I would like to introduce you to the individuals seated with me here this evening. On my far right is Mr. Kirk Gordon, Manager of the EIA Section with the Department of the Environment, and on my immediate right is Ms. Nancy White also from the Environment Department and Chairperson of the General Review Committee. On my far left if Bill Mouland, Project Manager for the Millbank project, and on my immediate left is Mr. Fred Meth, Director of Environmental Affairs for N.B. Power.

Throughout this evenings meeting there may input from consultants or employees from either the proponent or the Department of Environment. These individuals will be introduced at that time.

As you can see we are making use of a simultaneous interpretation service tonight so you can pick up a headset at the back of the room if you need one. I would like to point out that this meeting is being tape recorded so that an accurate record of comments and questions may be kept for consideration by the minister. The verbatim transcript of this meeting and the public participation report will be made available to the public when they are completed. If you wish to obtain a copy of the public consultation report, please sign the sheet at the table in the entry. I would ask that those of you who wish to ask questions or make comments use the microphones and identify yourself for purposes of accuracy in the transcript. I will point out we have a table microphone if you want to sit a floor or the podium.

The Department of Environment has received some requests from those who wish to make formal presentations here tonight. The order of these presentations is based on the order on which these speakers contacted the department. Once we've heard from these presenters, I will ask for additional presentations from the floor. And finally we open the floor to comments and questions from anyone who wishes to speak. I would like to remind you that written comments and questions are also welcomed by the minister of Environment and should be forwarded to his department by August 31.

We will at some time divide the proceedings by stopping for coffee break later in the evening. The panel is will to stay until all of your comments and questions have been addressed.

So, without further delay I am going to call on the first speaker, Mr. John Hubbard, who'll make the first presentation.

JOHN HUBBARD

I've never done this before so, John and Brenda Hubbard submitted to the Environment Impact Assessment committee regarding the Millbank generating station. As a resident of New Brunswick and in particular Millbank, I am alarmed that N.B. Power and the N.B. government will put corporate profits before the welfare of its citizens. They are going to build a four hundred megawatt generating station in the middle of a residential area, where we the people have to put up with the environmental hazards and they and the province of Quebec reap the benefits.

When the project was announced on March 2, 1990, and Miramichi leader I wrote a letter to the Department of the Environment addressing our concerns. Since then neither N.B. Power or the Environment Department has done anything to alleviate these concerns.

My first concern was the site selection. At the first public meeting in Millbank, it was made very clear that we the people did not want a project of this magnitude in the middle of a residential area. Alternate sites were proposed but N.B. Power chose to ignore us. Even after the prime reason for the site selection, the Millbank wharf was no longer valid they still refused to consider all their sites. Our MLA, Danny Gay, said at the public meeting 'if the people do not want yet the project, they do not have to have it'. But six months later we are still fighting to stop this project.

My second concern was the water. In my letter I was concerned about my well going dry, but not to worry it will not go dry the water will be replace with salt water. N.B. Power said it will guarantee my water but I have nothing in writing. I am wondering if this is the same guarantee they gave the people of Kerr's Trailer Park. I am wondering how N.B. Power can guarantee the

quality of my water when it has never been tested for bacteria, minerals or especially hydrocarbons or other health hazards. Also, with regard to water problems, I have asked N.B. Power for six months where there is a plant like this one that uses groundwater as its water source. They cannot find one. Does this not say something about their planning. They have no idea what effect this plant will have on my well.

My next concern was noise. Noise levels are ok say N.B. Power, but take my location, number 2 on map 4.60, four page sixty, average noise level 25 db, which is a soft whisper at fifteen feet. The projected noon level during plant operation is 38 - 40 db. A difference of 17. This means that the new level will be just about, will not be just a little bit louder but will be approximately four times as loud as the noise level there. Now, consider that noise levels double every 3 or 4 db. So forget about peace and quiet in Rockcliffe subdivision. The four, one hundred megawatt generating station are not even enclosed in a sound proof building.

Emissions, N.B. Power said not to worry this plant is clean but it will put out four times the amount of SO_2's as Miramichi Pulp and Paper does based on five hundred hours a year operation. See how you can juggle figures? Page 4.55. Scrubbers are not even suggested but would you eat blueberries, raspberries, strawberries or even consider growing vegetables with 628 tons of SO_2, 314 tons of NO2 and 105 tons of particles on end.

TV. Rockcliffe subdivision is in a low area and according to an ATV technician we get borderline coverage at best. What happens when this project is built and four, 100 megawatt generators come on line?

Vibrations. Would you not think that four,100 megawatt turbine generators would shake the shell rock they are mounted on. N.B. Power says no. I wonder and hope they are right.

Spills. N.B. Power contingency plan to deal with a spill is probably the worst piece of bull shit I have ever read in a long time. What happens if a valve lets go? N.B. Power will notify the property agency but this an unmanned site, who will notify N.B. Power? When N.B. Power had there first meeting with the people of Millbank, they said diesel fuel was the big concern regarding a leak. Now after reading the report we see that they are going to use caustic soda - 2500 kg, sulfuric acid - 12 000 kg, and potassium permanganate - 368 kg. Why were we not told of these chemicals and their health hazard at the first meeting.

Property value. N.B. Power said they would buy our house if we could not live with the plant. That sounds good except we do not want to move. From day one we suggest they build us six homes in a new subdivision just like we have now, but they said no. They

will give us a fair market price for our property. Why should we sell our homes we have lived in for twelve years just because N.B. Power, the worst polluter in the province, wants to move in? N.B. Power paid four times the market price for the undeveloped land for this plant but will not give us replacement value for our property.

In conclusion, I cannot see a plan of this magnitude being on a fast track as far as environment is concerned. After all it takes two years just to choose a reasonable dump site. When you call N.B. Power and they say this project is a go, it makes me think that the EIA is nothing but a farce. Please do not consider the money N.B. Power has wasted on buying and clearing land when making your final decision. Tell N.B. Power the citizens of New Brunswick will not be pushed around by big business, when health and welfare of this and future generations is at stake. Thank you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Thank you Mr. Hubbard. I am going to call on the next presenter. Mr. Bud Benjamin who will be presenting a brief on behalf of J. Fracker.

BUD BENJAMIN

Madam chairperson, panel and ladies and gentlemen, I have been asked on behalf of Jack Fracker, who was the Chairman of our citizens committee to read this presentation that he wants to make here this evening. Jack says this:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am a resident of Millbank and because I live in the vicinity of the proposed new 400 megawatt generating turbine plant, I feel the provincial government has neglected our concerns and issues regarding our environmental health in our community. I was unable to be here in person as I am away on vacation. But I feel it most important that I did make a presentation to voice my concerns regarding our environmental health in our community. I agree that we need progress to survive in this day and age but I also agree that if we work together we could assure our children that they will live in an environmentally safe community.

I built my home in Rockcliffe subdivision approximately ten years ago. It is a small community free of any great amount of commercial and industrial growth. I became very concerned when informed that a new generating station was in the plans for our community just a mere 700 meters from my home. I felt that it was very important that we the citizens of Millbank become actively involved in the study input which should be done before even considering to build this plant.

New Brunswick Power publicly announced the proposal to construct this plant on February 27, 1990, but it was not publicly

announced so that members of the community could attend. On March 1, 1990, which is shortly after this big announcement, the Department of Environment ordered that an EIA study be done. The citizens at this time became more concerned as we had had little time to get together and make our concerns known and inform Millbank citizens to do the same. Our concerns had to be forwarded to the New Brunswick Department of Environment on or before the thirty-first of March. Which is not much notice. I then contacted many citizens in the area and they felt that there was a great cause for concern so held a meeting on March 12, 1990, to make everyone aware of how to make their concerns known to the New Brunswick Department of Environment. It was at this meeting that the Concerned Citizens Group was formed on behalf of the residents of Millbank.

We then requested meetings with the New Brunswick Department of Environment and N.B. Power as a group to discuss our concerns and we felt we should be kept informed at all times as to what progress they were making in this EIA study. Please note our concerns were such issues as site location, water consumption, air emissions, noise, land value, power transmission lines and general health quality of our community.

After many meetings with the N.B. Power officials and the Department of Environment the study is now in its final stages and after reading the review committee report and the final EIA report, this fast track study still does not give us any guarantee on our concerns. According to the review committee they were to evaluate the adequacy of the EIA study but they say in their review that there is still technical issues to be resolved.

I would like to enlighten you on the fact that the trip to Michigan, which the N.B. Power arranged for us to view a similar plant was a total waste of time. This plant in Midland was burning natural gas and not diesel fuel, as per plans for Millbank. The plant in Midland was built in a very industrialized area, within a sound proof building, which is not the plan for Millbank. I had very little time to view and find out concerns from residents living in Midland as we were required to tour the plant and return to Canada on the same day. I did manage with little time we had to contact residents and some of their concerns were noise and TV and radio interference. Emissions were not a concern as natural gas runs cleaner than diesel fuel.

Upon returning to Millbank I held more meetings with our concerned citizens group and N.B. Power officials. We made it clear to the New Brunswick Department of Environment we should be more involved and informed in this project.

Now Jack goes on in site location.

In the beginning stages of this study it was stated that the plant had to be built in Millbank because of the wharf facilities and a fuel pipeline was required. We had requested the plant to be built away from residents but we were told this is not possible because of the cost of the pipeline. Now we are told that the wharf facilities of pipeline are no longer required, but it still has to built in Millbank. They say they have reviewed other site locations. How hard did they do on their studies. We the concerned citizens feel this plant is on the fast track and should not be built so near a residential area. Proper studies have to be looked into.

Under air emissions. How much SO_2 will there be emitted. After reading the final report it seems that this plant will emit more SO_2 than any major industry already operating on the river. Does the review committee not feel that there is a requirement that scrubbers be installed.

Power transmissions. The question he asks is: This has not been proven to be a health hazard. Do we have to wait until after it has been built to know how it will effect us?

Under accidental spills. Who in the Miramichi is trained and equipped for such accidents?

And under ground water consumption. As stated in the review committee report they generally agree the probability of drawdowns of the wells in the area and of salt water intrusion depends largely on duration of operation of the facility. The review committee felt a wellfield study would have facilitated the prediction of groundwater impacts with more certainty. Why I ask was this not done? How can the government give the go ahead to build before knowing what the effects will be? There are just too many questions still unanswered. What are the guarantees? We are still not enlightened as to how we will be sure that our quality of water will not change.

Under noise pollution. We live in a very quiet residential area. Can the government guarantee this will not change?

In summary I feel the EIA study was not efficiently done and they're still too many doubts as to how it will effect our quality of life as it is now. I believe in progress, but, I also believe that we can have progress and an environmentally safe province if we don't let dollars come first and health last. What will our children have to look at in the future? Are we lacking stricter environmental safety guidelines in our province?

N.B. Power has offered to buy our six homes in the Millbank area and this gives me great cause for concern. And he says all the dollars in the world could not replace our quality of life we hold in our community.

And in conclusion I feel alternative sites should be looked into in greater detail. Belledune, which was one considered is an industrial area and near port facilities. To my understanding the only reason it is not being constructed there is because of existing construction going on there. I cannot see any reason as why contracts with union could not be drawn up to be sure that there are no delays which seem to be the main concern of N.B. Power as to why everything is on this fast track. Time seems more important for this project. Also, no matter where this project were to be constructed, scrubbers should be a must to cut back on emissions.

Water wellfield studies should be done before even considering this plant and not after. Another alternative to water consumption would be to construct a desalination plant and use river water instead of groundwater.

N.B. Power representatives said they appreciate our concerns and will get answers for our concerns. We are still waiting. Lin Titus, Vice-president of N.B. Power said the plant will not built here if you don't want it here.

Respectfully submitted. Jack Fracker.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Please thank Mr. Fracker on my behalf.

BUD BENJAMIN

I will, thank you very much.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Would you like to come back to the microphone Mr. Benjamin and make your presentation.

BUD BENJAMIN

I would love to, I wouldn't mind standing here all day. I have one of my own here, I hope I'm not bothering people by doing two in a row, but, I had no control over the first one. This is the one I would like to suggest to you people here this evening and it is much shorter than Mr. Fracker's.

On March 5, 1990 I forwarded a letter to the New Brunswick Department of Environment expressing my concerns as to the construction of this 400 kilowatt thermal generating station at Millbank. And after several meetings and the reading of the Environmental impact assessment report, I am still very concerned about the construction of this facility.

Very few of the fears that I spoke of in my letter have been dispelled. And since reading the assessment report other matters of concern have surfaced, which were not mentioned in any of the meetings that I attended. I was told that all the water pumped would be used by the combustion turbines. And now I read that the water must be treated and that over six and half million gallons of waste water from the sediment pond is to emptied into the Miramichi river at the Millbank wharf. And more than this, if the plant runs in access of the five hundred hours that the power commission tell us it will.

During our meetings there was no mention of chemicals being stored at the site or even being used. And now I read that caustic soda, and the amounts are in the reports for everybody to see, sulfuric acid and potassium permanganate are to be used at this facility.

Now, at our meeting of April 23 with the Power Commission and with the Director of the Environmental Affairs who is here this evening, our residents committee requested that alternate sites for this plant be reconsidered. And at the meeting in Fredericton, on the 30th of April, the Committee was informed, and these are the words out of the report, that there was little room for further realignment of the project facility within the confines of the land opted to New Brunswick Power due to topographical conditions. Quite a statement. It was also emphasized that the requirement of the project schedules were such that it was not possible at this time to reconsider various alternate sites and still meet the in-service date for the project. And thus, no further consideration would be given to the two sites suggested by the Committee on the 23rd of April. Maybe that's the fast track that Mr. Fracker spoke of.

It is my opinion that if proper planning had been done before the site was selected, the lack of wharf facilities and the concerns of the Millbank residents could have been properly addressed, and a site agreeable to all could have been chosen. I haven't got this written here but it just seems impossible to me that a site could have been planned to spend all of this money on and after the thing was started people find out that can't use the wharf. It just boggles my mind.

My primary concern in the construction of this facility deals with water. On page 9 of the summary report I read that over pumping for an extended period of time presents a risk of contamination of local wells with salt water. The General Review Statement under impacts of groundwater consumption reads: A wellfield model report was not available for evaluation with EIA report. This information could have facilitated the prediction of groundwater impacts with more certainty, including the potential for restriction of future development. I'm going to read that again. Including the potential for restriction of future

development in the area adjacent to the plant. Therefore, the Review Committee recommends that a detailed monitoring plan be developed prior to the issuance of any approval to operate, which would insure protection of the groundwater resource. Should the project proceed this operational approval should specify the conditions under which the plant may continue to draw water from the aquifer. And that's out of the report.

And also, 7.5.1 of the EIA study says that:

> the hydrostatic test program related to the commissioning of the fuel storage tanks will provide an opportunity to confirm the findings of the groundwater exploration program in advance of plant operations. The test of the first tank will take place during February of 1991; this date falls within the expected period of operation of the plant when in service. The water for the test will be drawn from the plant production wells, all of which will be closely monitored to provide complete data respecting drawdown of the water table on the site. Nearby residential wells could also be monitored during these tests.

Now the question is does this mean that we have to wait until the plant is partly constructed and the fuel tanks are finished to find out about our water? You know, is this typical of good planning practices? And for once, perhaps, we should make sure before the construction begins. You see, we require a guarantee for our water, and that it will not be affected. Not some kind of a vague statement like is in the report, it is anticipated.

My concerns about noise level have been somewhat alleviated by the moving of the facility more into the wooded area. But however, I am still concerned in the light of the vague statement in the General Review Statement under impacts of operating noise. Which states:

> that nighttime noise levels are "normally acceptable"

and also, in the report we read this, these two sentences:

> the potential for the air-borne vibration of lightweight dwelling components, such as windows, may exist during the operation of the plant. This effect would be observed at the nearest residences as the barely perceptible vibration of windows when touched. The level of vibration would be less than that which may currently occur due to road traffic.

But road traffic is intermittent. This plant's going to run all the time.

Under gaseous emissions. Page 7 of the summary report has this paragraph and we refer lots to models during this.

> The models showed that sulfur emissions from the plant alone were well within provincial standards and national objectives. However, the report does identify that the combined emissions from other local sources contribute to a ground level concentration in excess of the provincial standards.

The reports words....I am concerned about this statement. And it is my understanding that we are trying to cut back on air pollution and not add to it.

And, in conclusion, I feel that this EIA report is full of uncertainties and it has left most questions still unanswered. The General Review Statement also says this:

> complete certainty and the prediction of noise and groundwater impacts prior to actual operation of the facility is difficult to achieve with existing technology.

You see, we the residents of this area are taking all the risks, and we are taking the tensions that are associated with these risks. The people you are selling your power to, Quebec Hydro, are spared from it all. No EIA, no meetings, no concerned citizens and no risks.

I thank you panel and madam chairman for this report.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Thank you Mr. Benjamin for taking the time to come today and voice your concerns.

I would like to call on our next scheduled presenter. We've had a few come in. Ms. Mary Gray, would you like to come to the microphone.

MARY GRAY

Mr. Chairman and the panel. I live on the corner of the Lloyd and McHardy Road and I have a few concerns.

The first concern I have is new transmission lines. I feel we have enough transmission lines now, we are surrounded by them. We have twelve volts of power coming into our house through the ground by way of our cast iron sewer pipe. Why? We don't know. Are we sitting on a hot spot? As a result we had to get the water system grounded.

Number two. Water consumption. So far we have plenty of good water. What guarantee do we have that our water will still remain the same? This plant requires a large amount of water for operation and will probably drain our water supply.

Stack emissions. I am also concerned about more pollution in our air than we already have now. I think it is a little late to consider the impact of such a facility after we are all dead. My mother-in-law passed away six years ago of cancer. I've had cancer and don't know when it will reoccur and dear knows how many more people in the area. It definitely isn't my life style.

Fuel deliveries. As the Millbank wharf seems to need a lot of repairs, fuel must now be trucked in from Saint John or Dartmouth. Our highways cannot handle the traffic now, so, this mode of transporting fuel seems out of the question.

Scrubbers. If this plant should go ahead we insist on scrubbers being installed. It is a must.

And finally our property value will drop considerably. Thank you very much.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Thank you very much. Our next presenter is Mr. Norman Richardson.

NORMAN RICHARDSON

Good evening. I just have a few thingS that I was bothered with when I read the report. I though I'd come and say how I feel about them. I'm a contractor with operation and I'm a wood lot owner. I also have some christmas trees in the area. This report says that christmas trees won't be affected. The little bit of study that I have done shows that if you have enough stuff going down to the trees its going to hurt them. If you'll look around REPAP and that island, all the trees are dead. They've all changed colour, if you have discolouration in christmas trees, don't try to sell them. So, because it was in the report that 30 miles area of christmas trees I felt concerned.

Erosion, it concerns me, erosion. They have to take all the top soil off of that area. In Big Brook there is a little stream that will run down, and after you take all the top soil, what is going to stop all the mud from going into the little stream and then to the Miramichi river? After they opened up the Miramichi college and the Keith Road they have big tractors operating there to train the people and they open up alot of ground. Everytime it rains the little Bartibog River gets all mud, and the same people are supposed to be looking after that are going to be looking after this project. They are not doing anything now, so, are they going

to do the same over there. They're going to have more problems.

Wildlife. It says on the report that there is no moose yard or deer yard. You can't have any deer or moose when there are no trees to be seen. You have to have trees. There used to be deer yards in there and moose, years ago, but people cut the trees and now they open up everything, so the animals left. I think that this report is false saying that there is no wild animal in that area. No deer and moose. I think there is some in there.

As a wood lot owner, I want to be sure that nothing will happen to the trees. My livelihood is to cut trees and merchantable lumber. If this plan goes ahead and damages all the trees, there is not much future for a guy that is doing his livelihood in the christmas trees and in the woods.

Power lines. I am concerned about how many power lines are going to be in that area. I have some properties in that area. If you have properties along the highway, now it's usually around $10 000 an acre, that is what they would value. They are only talking about putting the plant there, they are going to take some of my land on the Lloyd Road. They offered me $150 an acre. That is quite a drop.

If the plant is a go, I'd rather see the fuel hauled by boat. I don't think that they should haul the fuel by trucks. They are saying in the report that if you haul it by ship you might have some problems with beaches and you have the same problems with trucks. If you happen to take the ditch beside a bridge it's going to end up in the river anyway. So, I would say more sure to be by boat. I thank you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Thank you Mr. Richardson. We have one more scheduled presenter, Liane Thibodeau-Doucet.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

Once again, we the public, have been asked to provide our input regarding and environmental impact assessment. Once again, it appears that the decision to proceed with the project has already been made and that we spending a great deal of time and energy poring over lengthy, technical documents for nothing.

Allow me to elaborate upon my reasons for feeling this way. According to the environmental impact assessment, the opportunity to realise the benefits of this combustion turbine project was first recognised in mid December 1989. At this time selection and conceptual engineering activities began. In February the acquisition of the desired land in the Millbank area began. Since then the grubbing and clearing of the site has commenced. Let's

face it, no one, not even the government would spend this amount of money if the approval to go ahead was not a foregone conclusion.

However, we are assured in the General Review Statement pertaining to the environmental impact assessment that the minister of environment, no less, has determined that clearing and the grubbing of the site for the proposed generating station does not constitute a commencement of the construction and operation of the generation station. I wonder how many people would agree with the Minister on this one; not many, if any, I'm sure.

Once again it seems as though all of the decisions relating to the project are based upon the cheapest and most convenient alternatives, rather sound environmental reasoning. Witness the following statement from the summary report of the environmental impact assessment, and I quote directly,

> "combustion turbines have been selected for the Millbank project because they represent the only technology with the time schedule which would allow N.B. Power to meet the terms of the contract with Hydro Quebec. In addition, combustion turbines are considered the least expensive option for peaking capacity. New Brunswick does not have a natural gas resource, making diesel powered turbines the only viable alternative".

Later we find out that since the selection of the Millbank site, and the primary reason it was chosen, the marine delivery of fuel has been eliminated from the project. This decision was made due to the cost and scheduling factors of wharf rehabilitation, which made truck delivery a more attractive option. To quote the environmental impact assessment once again,

> "the marine delivery of fuel to the Miramichi estuary which formed such an important consideration in the original selection of the Millbank site, is no longer a practical plan and has been eliminated from the project.

The reasons for this are two fold. First, a detailed examination of the existing wharf indicated the need for extensive remedial work to bring it up to the required Transport Canada standard, and this work could not be completed in time to meet the project in-service date.

Secondly, when the alternative fuel delivery system of tanker truck delivery from a regional refinery was investigated, it became apparent that delivery by this means could be achieved efficiently and at considerably lower cost, due to the high cost of the necessary wharf renovations, the pipeline and associated pumps and their operation. From an environmental perspective, particularly in view of the worldwide attempts to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, there is absolutely no way to justify the trucking of

this fuel to the site all the way from Dartmouth or Saint John. Just think of the carbon dioxide emissions from 8 to 10 tanker trucks per day travelling all the way from Saint John or Dartmouth. Believe it or not, 375 000 barrels or oil per year will be trucked all the way from Saint John or Dartmouth. It just boggles the mind.

We are told that one of the major benefits of the project would be approximately $300 000 000 of financial benefits to the province of New Brunswick. Now let's look at the financial costs to the province of New Brunswick. And I am getting all of the figures directly from the environmental impact assessment. Capital costs are estimated at $252 000 000 and operating costs at $5 million per year over the next 20 years, for a total cost of $352 000 000. Not bad, spending 352 million dollars for revenues of 300. And this doesn't even include the cost of decommissioning the plant once the twenty years are up.

Next, we hear of all the jobs which are going to be created. If you look carefully, you'll see that there is a shortage of workers in some trades in the Chatham, Newcastle area, including pipefitters, electricians, iron workers and boiler makers. The majority of jobs created will be in these trades. In addition, other projects in the northeastern section of the province will be employing construction workers and tradespersons during 1990 and 1991. Therefore a significant percentage of hiring will take place outside the Chatham, Newcastle area. In fact, pipefitters and electricians are on the designated skill shortage lists for the province as a whole, and will probably be hired from outside the province. Then there are the eleven new full-time jobs to be created from maintenance and operation of the facility. However, the local labour market, according to the environmental impact assessment, doesn't have sufficient unemployed electricians, electrical mechanics, and millwrights to fill these positions.

The fuel for the combustion turbine units will be No. 2 diesel fuel, the only fuel available in New Brunswick for this type of unit, according to the environmental impact assessment. It also happens to contain .5 per cent sulfur content which is the maximum sulfur content permitted in diesel fuel at the present time. The resulting emission rate of .6 lbs. of SO_2 per million BTU's would meet the national emission maximum of, you guessed it, exactly .6 lbs. of SO_2 per million BTU's. The EIA states that the emission rates will be less than the Environment Canada guidelines. I don't know about you, but from what I know about mathematics, .6 is not less than .6.

The EIA makes some mention of NOx emissions. The design NOx emission limits for the Millbank units were based on the most stringent applicable Canadian standards available at the time the units were designed, specifically 1981. This even though N.B. Power knows that more stringent guidelines will be coming on stream

in 1994 and that Canada has signed an international agreement to freeze NOx emissions at 1987 levels. Meanwhile, emissions from N.B. Power diesel engines will be 5 times the 1987 levels by the year 2005.

Given the information presented in the EIA regarding sensitivity to acid rain within the defined airshed of the plant, I do not see how the approval can possibly be given to go ahead with the project.

And the remainder of the information is quoted directly from the report.

> Within the defined airshed, there is some highly sensitive areas to the northwest of the site.
>
> Agricultural soils in New Brunswick have been classified according to their susceptibility to acidification. Within the Millbank airshed, sensitivity ranges from sensitive to not sensitive in the area immediately surrounding the proposed Millbank Thermal Generating Station.

Most of the area within the airshed is not even classified.

> There is the potential of acid rain to affect agricultural operations. Within the Millbank airshed, a number of agricultural operations are conducted. Relative terrain sensitivity to acidification is indicated as intermediate to high.
> The sensitivity of surface waters using the Calcite Saturation Index ranges from high sensitivity to not sensitive, however, the majority of the classification falls in the area of high sensitivity and sensitive.

It goes on to say that

> a number of environmentally significant ecosystems systems have been identified as habitats for rare plants upon which gaseous emissions might impact. The ecosystems and plants concern the following, and I have only listed a few of them, there are many more listed in the report: Bay du Vin Island - is the site of a rare plant, I have never taken latin in school so you'll have to bare with my pronunciations, Distichlis spicata; Beaubears Island - a white pine stand; the Chatham-Newcastle area - habitat for rare plants, Salmolus valarandi, Stellaria crassifolia and others; the Enclosure Provincial Park, white pine stands; Loggieville, wet shores or habitant for rare plant Montia fontana; Miramichi River Estuary, site of rare plant Epilobium ciliatum.

Habitats for a number of bird species and, or endangered species have also been identified as environmentally significant ecosystems. Birds within the Millbank airshed can be significantly affected if they feed on plants that are particularly susceptible to acid rain and there are a number that have been identified as being so susceptible. As well, sensitivity of the surface waters could impact terrestrial and aquatic organisms within the airshed.

The most significant example is the endangered Piping Plover nesting sites, there are ten pairs in Neguac and Neguac Beach, as well as, Tabusintac Beach.

Perhaps the most significant fact mentioned in the report relating to sulfur dioxide emissions is that the combined emissions from other local sources contribute to a ground level concentration in excess of provincial standards, which you've already heard earlier this evening.

When considering project alternatives the EIA document makes the following statement: the only viable alternative to the proposed project would be to forego the proposed export contract and cancel the project.

The Miramichi Environmental Society would support this observation. We are saying that in view of the information contained in the EIA, the Minister has no alternative but to do just that, cancel the project.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Thank you Miss Thibodeau-Doucet. I will ultimately be opening the floor to comments and questions, but at this time I would like to know if there are any other formal presentations that anyone would like to make, before we break for coffee?

O.K., well, we will schedule a fifteen minute break until 8:10, at the time if you have clarifications or comments or questions you have time to formulate them during the break.

COFFEE BREAK

I would like to reconvene this meeting. I will begin by explaining the procedure, or remind you of the procedure. If you have a question or comment would you please approach one of the three microphones and identify yourself for the record. Everything that is spoken today will be recorded verbatim and presented to the Minister.

To begin, I am going to call on Mr. Fred Meth who would like to make a few comments in response to some of the things that have been said here tonight.

FRED METH

Thank you Angela. I'd just like to discuss a couple of the issues that I heard here. Obviously there were a number of things raised, but there were three which I thought were extremely important from the point of view that I think we should try to clarify a couple of things.

Now, the first one, I think of, of most immediate interest to residents in the area around the proposed site, is the guarantee of a groundwater supplies. Now, we have extended verbally, we've given our word to the residents of the Rockcliffe Subdivision that: that water supply would be guaranteed by us, whether that meant in the invent of a well going dry, for whatever reason that was associated with our operation there, that we would rectify that situation. And we are prepared to extend that guarantee to the homes between the site, and basically a one kilometre radius around the entire wellfields which, extends it quite a bit further than what we had originally done.

We offered this at the time, because it was asked for by residents of this area and we are prepared to extend that guarantee. We're still firmly convinced that we won't have to recognize that, in a sense that I don't think there are going to be claims on it. We have from our consultants some assurance from the testing that has been done, that the water supplies will be there. Nevertheless, we will extend that guarantee, we will make it in writing, we're working on a draft and that will be delivered to every household within the radius I've just discussed.

Secondly, I would like to address the issue of sulfur in diesel fuel and the level of SO_2 associated with that. The numbers of course are in the report, those numbers are based on the maximum allowable, and that is .6 lbs. as it's been pointed to you earlier. When we actually test diesel fuel in New Brunswick, the levels which are found in diesel fuel, and we do this routinely because we have a similar type of facility in Grand Manan that burns diesel fuel and we test this fuel on every delivery. We find that the level actually found in the fuel is about half of the allowable level, it runs between .2 and .3 per cent. We've been advised by Environment Canada, that in a two years time the allowable level of sulfur in diesel fuel will drop from .5 per cent to .05 per cent that's 1/10 of todays level.

The modelling results are based on todays maximum allowable level, so you can see that this will change dramatically a couple of years down the line when the refineries actually have to take out more than they take out now. They do take out a large proportion of the sulfur that's found in fuel. There are two ways of removing sulfur from fuel, one is before you use it, and of course, the other one is after you use it. It's the technology after the fuel is burnt which incorporates what's popularly called

the scrubber. In fact, when you use a refined fuel, when much of the sulfur is removed in the refinery, which is what occurs with diesel fuel you're in effect scrubbing it before you use it.

The last point that I would like to make, has to do with nitrogen oxides or NOx. We are aware of course of the 1994 NOx plan which Environment Canada has issued in a draft version, and it's now being revised. And I should advise you that there are no standards in that plan for diesel fired combustion turbines and that is the reason we are using the standard of 1981. If we had been advised of a standard of this for 1994, you can be assured that we would be designing to that standard but there has been no changes indicated in the NOx VOC plan, which is out in draft form now.

As I said it is being revised, and perhaps in the revision there will be such a number, if that's the case we have not been advised of it. We are using the best possible technology today for this type of combustion turbine to reduce the NOx formation in the combustion process to the levels which are currently included in the Environment Canada Standard. Thank you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Thank you Fred. So I open the floor now to any question or comments.

BURT RICHARD

Yes, my name is Burt Richard. I come from that famous area called Taintville over on the other side of the river, where we've been blessed already with a waste dump from N.B. Power.

Now, since you've got all this fancy stuff here and promised so much. From the time that you put in that waste dump over there you promised us a liner in that dump. Mr. Meth, was that ever put in?

FRED METH

Yes it was.

BURT RICHARD

It was not. At the time it was not put in. They said at the time, that it was to late in the year, so they operated without it. Don't tell me there's a liner there, there isn't.

FRED METH

Perhaps I could ask Mr. MacDonald to comment on this.

BURT RICHARD

Mr. MacDonald from the Hydro.

MR. MCDONALD

There most definitely is a liner in the disposal site.

JULIE RICHARD

What kind of a liner, a clay liner?

MR. MCDONALD

We put clay in one area, and a duraplex liner in a second area.

JULIE RICHARD

Why would they tell me their wasn't when I called and asked you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Excuse me, could you please use the microphone.

BURT RICHARD

Anyways, then we were told that there was supposed to be monitoring over there. There have never been any results reported from that monitoring, has there? None that I am aware of.

MR. MCDONALD

Results have been made available to the town.

BURT RICHARD

To the town, they haven't been published in the papers or anything have they?

MR. MCDONALD

The results have also been available to New Brunswick Environment.

BURT RICHARD

Not to the residents of the area?

MR. MCDONALD

I'm sure if you went to the New Brunswick Environment that they would supply those results.

FRED METH

If you care to leave your name and address with me you'll be assured that you'll get those results.

MR. MCDONALD

I will ask, as soon as this meeting is through.
Now, to get to the point of this meeting right here. The first question I meant to ask you, how much ash will be generated from this plant if any? None?

FRED METH

None.

BURT RICHARD

So there would be no additional load on our waste site over there from this plant then?

FRED METH

There will be a very small additional load, in the sense that the sedimentation lagoon on site will periodically be cleaned, and the sediment from that will go to the ash disposal site, that's correct.

BURT RICHARD

Yes, that's interesting. O.K. some more dirt for us. Now getting back to this report. The first question I have, and probably you can answer this or maybe Mr. MacDonald can. Is there any money penalty with Quebec involved, if this 400 megawatts generating facility is not brought on line as per schedule? And how much per day is involved?

FRED METH

I'm afraid I can't answer that question, I am not involved in the financial side. I'll ask Mr. Doug Bartlett, if he could take the mike and possibly answer that question.

DOUG BARTLETT

The financial penalties for the contract come forward in

November 1, 1991. If the plant, or any portions of the plants are not available by then, the payment on the capacity reduces from $105 a kilowatt year to $100 a kilowatt year. So essentially, if none of the capacity was available come November 1, 1991, I think the difference would be about $30 million.

BURT RICHARD

Thirty Million dollars per what?

DOUG BARTLETT

Over the life of the contract.

BURT RICHARD

Over the life of the contract. So, your talking about a million and a half dollars a year? Approximately. Twenty year contract.

DOUG BARTLETT

It's not a levelized difference, the units come back on a schedule part way through, one unit comes back in 1998, and another comes back on our system in 2002, and the final 200 megawatts come back in 2011, so its not a levelized million and a half a year, or whatever you...

BURT RICHARD

In other words, the main penalty be would be at the first of the contract where all units were supposed to be on line.

DOUG BARTLETT

The payment is a levelized payment through the life of the contract, and the difference would be $5 a kilowatt year. So, you would have to take that difference and multiply it by the capacity differences over the years to get what the annual differences would be. The total over the life of the contract, for capacities not available would be in the range of $30 million.

BURT RICHARD

O.K., that answers our question, one of the questions as to why they're so anxious to get on line. Let's switch over to our man from the environment department here. I'm going to ask you a direct question, and I intend to get a direct answer. What are the limits to SO_2 emissions, under the Federal and Provincial Regulations now, that apply to N.B. Power? And is there any money penalties attached to these regulations?

KIRK GORDON

Mr. Richard I have to apologize this evening for the lack of attendance by our air quality specialists. If you'd like to leave that question with me, I'd be happy to get answers for you on the SO_2 limits. Your question regarding financial penalties, obviously the Department that we work for does not consider the kinds of things your talking about in the contractual arrangements. What we of course do deal with, are the normal penalties and fines under our legislation. If people are found to be out of compliance and are charged and taken to court and so on.

BURT RICHARD

O.K., I'll put it to you another way, then, If you don't want to answer it that way.

KIRK GORDON

I would like to answer the question.....

BURT RICHARD

Are there any regulations that limit N.B. Power under the provincial laws, under the Air Quality laws of the Province? Are there any that govern?

KIRK GORDON

Again, I'm not Air Quality specialist, and I would of liked to of had that person here tonight, but, unfortunately that's not possible. In the operating approval for this facility there will be no doubt emission levels set in the approval, those things are being negotiated currently as you can read in the document yourself by federal provincial agreement and those are the targets that I understand will be met. That's all I can say.

BURT RICHARD

I'll put it to another way then, there are regulations in law for let's say a pulp mill are there not?

KIRK GORDON

There are emissions limits set on approvals for all industries, pulp mills included.

BURT RICHARD

I'm going to put this another way then if you won't state it, as far as I know there are no emissions levels set for N.B. Power.

They are law into themselves.

KIRK GORDON

Could I ask Neil Brodie from the Department to respond to that. Neil is the Manager of the Approvals Sections and perhaps can answer that.

NEIL BRODIE

When the permit is done up for the plant, assuming it gets through the EIA process, there will be set numbers in the permit, limiting the amount of SO_2, and I expect NOx as well, and particulate matter. So that permit will become a regulation for that particular plant. Is that the type of answer you were looking for?

BURT RICHARD

What legislation to you have that covers Colson Cove for example, what emissions levels apply there?

NEIL BRODIE

I don't know what the specific numbers are, but, I can.....

BURT RICHARD

It's the largest polluter in New Brunswick, aren't they? As far as SO_2 goes.

NEIL BRODIE

They're the largest discharger of SO_2, yes.

BURT RICHARD

The largest polluter then. And isn't true that three quarters of the New Brunswick sulfur emissions come from N.B. Power, because of their complete lack of scrubbers?

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Mr. Richard, I'm going to direct your question to our representatives from N.B. Power, who will hopefully address it for you.

FRED METH

We do have very specific limits on everyone of our operating facilities, and I'll ask Mr. Burns if he would take the microphone for a moment to a elaborate on that.

LEO BURNS

My name is Leo Burns, I'm a Meteorologist and Air Quality specialist with N.B. Power. First of all, N.B. Power is regulated, in fact the regulations we have are stringent, or more stringent than they are for other industries in the province.

With respect to the sulfur content in our fuel oil, we are required to have a lower sulfur content than other industries. The regulation that applies is the Clean Environment Act, and under that there's an Air Quality Regulation, I believe, regulation 8306, I'm not quite sure. As part of that regulation, each of our plants must have an approval to operate, these are short term approvals, they're valid from 1 to 5 years, and they address the fact that we must meet the terms of the Air Quality regulations.

And in addition, there would be specific terms for each plant, reflecting the issues at that particular location that we would have to meet. In some plants we have specific emission limits, all plants have to have the emissions controlled such that ground level concentrations are met. So there is really a mixture, as we look around the plants. Each plant is dealt with on an individual basis, but directly or indirectly emissions must be controlled such that ground level concentrations, of the normal pollutants that are associated with power plants are within the Ammeter Quality Standards.

In addition, with respect to emissions from our newer plants particulary our Belledune plant, the Chatham plant we have here, and the Millbank plant, they have all been designed such as they would meet the most stringent environmental emission limits, that were enacted sometime ago, but they're still in place, with respect to sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide and particulate.

BURT RICHARD

O.K. fine. But I find it interesting that each plant has its own set of regulations. There is no overall regulation, except this 8306, apparently. But, now another concern of mine looking over.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Excuse me, would you just like to respond to that.

LEO BURNS

No, excuse me, I didn't mean to mislead you. All plants are controlled under the provincial regulations, which is the Air Quality Regulation under the Clean Environment Act of the Province of New Brunswick. In addition to that, there are specific terms

that have to deal with the Air Quality license for that plant. But there is a regulation that all plants must come under.

BURT RICHARD

O.K. Now this Environment report here, apparently is a small version of the big one, just an excerpt. I looked through it and I found something interesting to me, maybe you could answer this question, is there any plans to expand the size of this plant in the future?

FRED METH

No there are none.

BURT RICHARD

Well, what I find interesting is, is this figure of 375 barrels a day, gallons, what is it 375 barrels per year, is that an accurate figure?

FRED METH

375 thousand.

BURT RICHARD

375 barrels of oil per year?

FRED METH

No it can't be 375 barrels a day.

BURT RICHARD

375 thousand barrels per year. I think that's on page 8 of that report.

FRED METH

I don't see it.

BURT RICHARD

8 or 9 whatever, let's see Page 9. And then they have another figure, somewhere in this report, it says they use 30 litres per second when they're in full operation. If you correlate these figures, I come out with about 30 days production on the plant, yet you state your only going to run it for 500 hours a year.

FRED METH

500 hours per year is the anticipated level of operation that's correct.

BURT RICHARD

This is 50% above the anticipated level right there, to start with.

FRED METH

I don't think it can be.

BURT RICHARD

Well, maybe my figures are wrong. Another thing too, if you look at the storage capacity, I find it interesting that they're going to have around 24 days storage on site. Is that normal for a plant that is only going to operate 20 days a year?

UNKNOWN

Yes, that storage capacity is to give us a buffer in the deliveries of fuel.

BURT RICHARD

You need a years buffer?

UNKNOWN

It's simply to make sure that we have an adequate supply of fuel.

BURT RICHARD

These figures that you state all hinge on 500 hours operation a year. What your saying is this is standby power that you'll run 4 to 6 hours a day, whenever it is required, let's say at supper time or some period like that?

FRED METH

That's correct, it will be used only if we cannot supply that Hydro Quebec contract from other sources in our system. If for example, the rest of the system is up and running at full capacity, and we have to turn this plant on in order to supply that export requirement then we would do so. But at all other times, if there was any kind of capacity left in our system, because we had a lower demand than full capacity in our system, we would use that because it would be cheaper to generate. So, it is a reserve plant, it is a stand by and probably a stand by of a last resort because diesel fuel is expensive to burn.

BURT RICHARD

O.K. getting back to diesel fuel. According to your figures on page 7, your talking about .6 kilotons per year, that's 6 hundred tons per year of SO_2 emissions and 500 hours operation, right?

FRED METH

That's correct.

BURT RICHARD

That tells me that there would be 1.2 tons per hour of SO_2 emitted. Would that be a half correct figure?

FRED METH

Approximately.

BURT RICHARD

In other words, if you have an inversion, or you know, still air even, your talking an awful pile of SO_2. Do the people around here realize the affect of the SO_2, aside from acid rain as such? Do they realize what it will do, as far as asthma and other conditions like that?

FRED METH

Well the levels from this plant will be extremely low.

BURT RICHARD

Well, 1.2 tons per hour, is not low under any circumstances as far I'm concerned.

FRED METH

When you consider that it's coming out of a stack which is going to be 45 metres high, and that it will rise probably that same distance again, before its dispersed....

BURT RICHARD

It'll be dispersed over our area across the river then.

FRED METH

It is extremely low, in fact it will be so low that we won't be able to measure it.

BURT RICHARD

I have to disagree with you there, when your talking 1.2 tons per hour that's an extreme discharge, as far as I'm concerned. What are you talking, in terms of parts per million on exhausted air. You know pounds per million lbs. of air exhausted.

FRED METH

I'm not quite sure I understand your question.

BURT RICHARD

What are you talking in terms of parts per million in the exhaust gases, you know like when you test it with chemicals, what are you talking in terms of parts per million, grams per litre whatever you measure it in?

FRED METH

I don't have those figures on my finger tips. We can certainly calculate that and get them to you.

BURT RICHARD

These are the figures that actually count, because what your counting on is that highest stack to disburse, what I consider an extremely high level of SO_2. I don't have the air figures in here in order to calculate the parts per million, but considering 1.2 tons per hour, it just sounds awful high. What's the diameter of your stack?

FRED METH

I wonder if I could ask Mr. Burns to take the microphone for a moment please.

LEO BURNS

I don't have an exact number but, .6 lbs. a million BTUs is equivalent to around 320 or so, parts per million of oil, and I assume that would be the same for diesel. The diameter of the stack is around 4.9 meters. It's 45 meters high, it's going to have a exit gas temperature of approximately 500 degrees Celsius, it'll have a high velocity, the plume will raise well into the air, and all the modelling studies using modelling for each hour for over 5 years to take into account things like; still air and the worse types of conditions you could get, would show that the worst condition that we would have from that plant, would be, not only less than the provincial standard, but probably two thirds less than the provincial standard. And that would only happen only one hour out of about 40 thousand hours, if the plant had to be running

during that time. So, for those that have a concern about sulfur dioxide emissions, although one ton an hour appears to be large, if you look at the design of the plant, plus the sulfur content in the fuel, and the normal dispersion, again looking at the concentrations and the (annular) quality it would be well below that.

BURT RICHARD

Well, when it comes right down to it, I can't see the point of putting the plant here. Well you say you've got a contract with Quebec, why would you get tied into something with Quebec that you suffer penalties like these under. Is there any reason for it, that you trade power back and forth as such or whatever?

FRED METH

If I could ask Mr. Bartlett to a address that please.

DOUG BARTLETT

I guess, probably the easiest way to put it is, that this is kind of assuring arrangement of a reserve capacity. New Brunswick over the next ten years or so, needs combustion turbine capacity to handle our own peaking type loads. Rather than build those units in large chunks and pay the full cost of them, what we've tried to do with this arrangement, with Hydro Quebec, whereby they need the capacity, we tried to share in the cost, whereby their essentially paying for the units for us, and we're getting second hand units back on our system when we need them, to serve our in province load, for peaking capacity. So, I guess if you look at it in that respect, that's the arrangement we've tried to work out with this.

BURT RICHARD

Well, when it comes right down to it, I've got two main concerns about this plant. One, is the fact that there is no scrubbers, or any method of cleaning the before submitted to atmosphere. This I find ridiculous, in this day and age where everybody talks about acid rain and all the rest of it. But, I guess you can't say any different, when your boss goes on television, the minister responsible for N.B. Power; I was listening to him tonight, and he claims that 85% of the SO_2 in the air in this province is from outside sources. So, he said so what, if a we generate a miserly 15%, we're not going to make that much difference.

Well, I believe that somebody has to set the path, and even if it does cost us a couple of dollars extra a month, or whatever the figure would be, I can't see the reason for omitting a scrubber in this day and age from any plant. You say your within the environment guidelines. Well, a lot of times, I find that these

environment guidelines are very high, as far as I'm concerned and there's no reason, with the modern technology that these emissions couldn't be reduced and easy 80 or 90%.

You're more familiar with this technology than I am Mr. Meth. If a scrubber was installed in this plant, based on these figures right here, how much could the emissions be brought down to? Would there be an 80% reduction and costs, with let's say for a 20 million dollars cost? Do you have any figures from this?

FRED METH

No I don't. And the reason I don't is, that the level of sulfur in this fuel is so low to begin with that, I mean, it has been scrubbed in the refinery already. The sulfur has been removed. If you compare this, for example, with the fuel oil that we burn at Colson Cove and Courtney Bay, that fuel oil is running between 2 1/2 and 2 3/4% sulfur content. This is going to be running at .2 to .3% with a maximum of .5 for a couple of years, and then it goes down to .05 and we couldn't improve on that with a scrubber.

BURT RICHARD

O.K. we'll leave it at that. Do you have any costs of a scrubber, you say you couldn't improve on that with a scrubber?

FRED METH

We'd have to work very, very hard to improve on it even a little bit, let's put it that way.

BURT RICHARD

Well, I find this very hard to believe when your talking 1.2 tons per hour, that you couldn't scrub that out. Getting on to the other point. If, and whenever you decide to expand this plant, if Quebec needs a little bit more power and your buddies down in the States needs a bit more power, what process do you have to go through at that time, do you have to go through another EIA study or is this it?

FRED METH

I fully expect that we would have too.

BURT RICHARD

Even if you just walked in another turbine or two or whatever those things are called? Diesel engines.

FRED METH

Under the Environmental Impact Assessment of New Brunswick, the regulation, any type of a project has to be registered.

BURT RICHARD

O.K. What about these, your saying that you're only going to run them possibly 500 hours a year. Is there any limit that limits you to run 500 hours a year? Can you run a 1000 hours a year without getting another permit?

FRED METH

Yes we could, and there are situation certainly where in an emergency case, if we were to lose a plant like Point Lepreau or one or more units at Colson Cove for example, that you might exceed 500 hours per year. But the normal anticipated operating regime of this plant is 500 hours per year.

BURT RICHARD

That's only if there's only no emergencies.

FRED METH

That's if there's no emergencies that would require us to turn it on, but again, it is the most expensive plant in the system and to operate, and it would be the plant of last resort to use in a situation like that as well.

BURT RICHARD

How many field monitoring environment units are you going to have installed, say one across the river, one down the river and so on? Are you going to have little units set up to monitor the air quality and such from this unit?

FRED METH

Not specifically as part of this plant, at least not for the atmospheric emissions, what we will have as part of a larger monitoring program that we are going to be extending to this part of this province, we have it now in the southern part of the province around the Colson Cove plant. We will be locating a station somewhere in this area, so that it...

BURT RICHARD

A station, not let's say four stations on the points of the compass , 3 or 4 miles away.

FRED METH

No, if we have one station, which would give us a fix, then we can use an atmospheric dispersion model to predict from that what it would be in the other areas.

BURT RICHARD

O.K. Another point that somebody else brought up that I would like to question. Is there going to be a 24 hour security on site over there once the plant is built?

UNKNOWN

The plant will be run out of the Chatham plant, it will be totally in fenced, with a security fence, the switch yard itself inside the area will also be fenced in, so it will be double fencing on the switch yard, and all the buildings will be protected with intrusion alarms and monitors which will be all connected into the Chatham plant. Plus we'll also have routines to check the plant out.

BURT RICHARD

You are not going to have anybody on site, for even eight hours a day?

UNKNOWN

When the plant is running, the amount of people on site would probably increase, when its sitting idle of course if will be monitored out of the Chatham plant.

BURT RICHARD

Your going to have a demineralizer facilities on site over there?

UNKNOWN

We're going to have a water treatment plant, consisting of a reverse osmosis plant, and a small scrubber unit which is the demineralizer, which is a part of the water treatment system.

BURT RICHARD

This will be highly automated as such.

UNKNOWN

Yes it's highly automated, all plugged into the central plant computer, which we have the redundant computer in the Chatham plant

for the controls.

BURT RICHARD

Ah, that doesn't wash at all. What about when an automatic valve goes wrong over there and you start dumping 50 gallons a hour caustic or whatever into the sewer?

UNKNOWN

The plant has several monitoring points around it, as well the caustic tanks and so on are a enclosed in an incasement.

BURT RICHARD

I have had a little bit of industrial experience with this type of equipment, and it just doesn't wash. You have to have a man on site, visually watching valves like that. You can have all the fancy gadgets you want across that river and there's no way, if something really goes wrong, that you'll be able to pick it up from over there. I know from hard experience. You know cost cutting is the very best, you have to do it in industry and everything else, when you start cost cutting.....when you don't have people on site to monitor your plant from intrusion and from possible malfunction of automatic valves and something like this demineralizer.

That's not cost cutting that's penny pinching. I mean penny pinching to the point where you're jeopardizing peoples lives, and you're jeopardizing the environment, and you're even letting yourself open to law suits. In case somebody, let's say a small child would ever happen to wander into those gates, that were left open by, you say you've got two rows of gates and so on, also employees who can forget to lock those gates.

And, I just don't see it. To my mind a site is only secure when you have personnel on it 24 hours a day. That's the only way you can secure a site. There is no way that you can secure a site with electronics. That has been proven in the past.

And this plant, just doesn't make any sense to me at all as far as I'm concerned, mainly because, ok, you're going to sell your power to Quebec. This is some kind of an estate deal in order to get ahead a little bit in money. But, in order to do this, you're constructing this plant 15 to 20 years in advance of when we need it. By the time that we need it, there will probably be something brand new or at the very least all of your electronics and all that would all be a bunch of nothing by that time. Everything is brand new every 5 to 10 years now.

What you are talking about, is you're supplying power to Quebec and they're sitting up there laughing at us, because, we are

the ones that take the results of it. We're the outhouse for them. That's what it comes down to.

I guess that will be my final comment.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

I am going to give the opportunity to the gentlemen at the back who was waiting there for quite a while. He was standing earlier. Would you like to approach the microphone, I'm just going to invite a couple of comments from Mr. Meth first and then it will be your turn to speak.

FRED METH

Just in regard to your last comment, I just want to indicate that Hydro Quebec is also building some of these units in Quebec. It's not just us who are building them.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

O.K. Would you please identify yourself.

GEORGE LYONS

Yes, I would just like to refer to a statement you made about guaranteeing the water.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Excuse me sir could you please state your name.

GEORGE LYONS

George Lyons. Millbank. Why would you hold that to a kilometre, if you were the cause of somebody's water being polluted a few feet from that kilometre?

FRED METH

That's a very valid point and we have no intention of holding this necessarily to a kilometre. What I have done now, is expanded that to the distance that we have been advised, that we might expand it to, by our consultant in this area. If their is a situation where we have in affect outside of that one kilometre, I'm here to guarantee you right now that we'll take care of it.

GEORGE LYONS

Thank you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Yes, please state your name.

JULY RICHARD

Julie Richard. I'm also from the area called Taintville. First of all I would like to offer the people from Millbank my condolences on their new power plant. We attended such meetings as this over our ash dump. Now, as far as I'm concerned there are no rules for N.B. Power. They do as they please. I was told by the power plant in Chatham that there was no liner put in because they were in such a hurry, the same as you are now, to get this ash dump going that they didn't take the time to put it in. So, I'm not going to go out there and dig now to see if it is in. I was told it wasn't so, therefore, it isn't. What they tell me now after they have dumped tons and tons and tons of ash is on. I can't dig it up to find out. So, therefore, at the time they told me no, so therefore it's no.

Now I'm sure that these people in Millbank will get the same attention that our ash dump has received in the past year or so. There are gates that are open 24 hours a day. I called Fredericton, the Environment Department, I called N.B. Power to inform them that these gates are open. There is nobody monitoring these gates. Anybody can go in, with whatever they wish, leave it there. There were men back there a while ago, in little white suits, with little white hats walking around, somebody had dumped something and they were putting this aside.

So, therefore, we don't know what's going in and as my husband had said a while ago we have never been told how water is now. There've been no water statements given to us. We have no idea whether our water is contaminated, or not, by the ash dump. I don't know why the big hurry for this Millbank thing, accept like there is a penalty maybe per day if it is not completed. As far as your water protection from the department of hydro, I received a letter from Mr. Les Hall and the Minister of Environment in the Hatfield government was from St. Stephen, I forget his name now, and he said that if anything happened to our water that they would come good for it we'll say. Those weren't the exact words. But, that is only as good as the paper it was written on. I don't want trucked in water, pumped in water. I want my own water that I got there twenty years ago. Before they dumped the ash dump on me.

So, if you want to sit back and let them put their new power plant and have their little beds go bad, and it seep into your wells and sit there and let them do it. Because trucked in water, or pumped in water, or however they want to bring it is not the same as the water that you have when you built there. And so therefore, what they say they will do is not what will be done in the end, because they said they'd put a liner and after the ash

dump went in they told me at the Chatham plant; no, there is no liner went . We were in a hurry to get the thing done and no liner went in.

So therefore, I would just like to say that I did attend several meetings for the ash dump. We got it, we have it, we can't get rid of it, so what was the point. I come over here tonight because I was told that public relations person from N.B. Power told you people don't worry about what's going to go out the stack because they're going to get it. So therefore, I thought, I'd better come over. Because I am afraid we are going to get it and the way the meetings going tonight, I'm sure we're going to get it and I'm sure they're going to build the plant in Millbank. Thank you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Do you have anymore questions from the floor? O.K. would you like to go ahead.

JULIE MATCHETT

My name is Julie Matchett, I live Rockcliffe subdivision. Now a lot comments came a while ago about asthma, and I'll tell you a short story. My father died at 52 of asthma, and I have a lot of allergies, I have asthma. I have a little girl here who has it. Just the east wind that blows from the river bothers her, she has to get in the house. I have a lot of allergies, including diesel fuel. Now, you say that the air is not going to reach us, because the stacks are going to be high, and it is going to be landing over there. Am I gonna have to move, and where in the hell am I going to move to? I worked pretty near thirteen years to get that house where I live. I've got it paid and mortgaged next year, and I wanted to finish work. And I have no intention of moving out of there, unless you people pay me a damn good fortune to get me out of there. I was, I'm sure I was the second person to live there at the time. Mr. Wheaton would know. As a single mother of two children, I have no intention of working until I am 65 just because N.B. Power is forcing me out of a place that I lived, I worked 13 years to pay. Thank you.

BUD BENJAMIN

My name is Bud Benjamin and I'm back up here again. I can answer Mrs. Richards question that she addressed to N.B. Power, they don't have to answer it, it's right here, it says then the N.B. Power would compensate for loss of water by trucking in supplies, until a permanent solution could be achieved by N.B. Power. So that's how we would get our water, trucked in.

I just have two questions here, very simple should be easy to

answer. The first one, is there somebody here from Fisheries, maybe the Environment people can answer this. Do you see any problem with that water, that's being expelled from the sediment pond, going into the Miramichi River? This 13,000 gallons an hour or so on, is there any problem with that water? I mean I live right on the river, I know what the water looks like, I don't think you could make it any worse, but I'm just wondering, you know, whether you could make it any worse or not? Is there any problem with it?

KIRK GORDON

Neil Brodie could I ask you to come to the microphone please?

NEIL BRODIE

With the settling of the solids in the treatment pond, the discharge that is going there is the discharge going to the river from that pond will contain basically the same chemicals that were pumped from the ground water, principally iron, manganese. Those things are certainly present in good levels in the river right now, so my answer to your question is no, I wouldn't anticipate that causing a problem to the river or to the fisheries in the river.

BUD BENJAMIN

So, your telling me that the same water that's being pumped back in is the same type of water that's coming out of the ground, or are we adding something to it?

NEIL BRODIE

No, I'm saying the chemicals that are coming out and being removed in the process are the ones that were in the groundwater, and that same groundwater is part of what feeds the Miramichi River as well.

BUD BENJAMIN

So it would be exactly the same then as us pumping, like more fresh water into the Miramichi River. Once we take this out, if we only pump in 13,000 gallons an hour it would be the same as us pumping in maybe half a million gallons of groundwater, like its the same concentration isn't it?

NEIL BRODIE
You mean the same net amount of chemicals? Yes.
BUD BENJAMIN

Yes. So it would be exactly the same as groundwater, like?

NEIL BRODIE

Yes, same chemicals.

BUD BENJAMIN

But we can't use that effluent over again though, is there some reason why, if its the same, that it can't be recycled and used over again, instead of discharging it into the river?

NEIL BRODIE

I wouldn't want to say yes or no, it would depend on the designers of the plant.

BUD BENJAMIN

Well surely somebody has looked at this, haven't they? I mean surely, you know, we're not going to run an eighteen inch pump line into the river and just pump that water in there, if it can be reused. Mr. Meth.

FRED METH

I'll ask Mr. Phinney to address that please. Mr. Phinney is with Monenco Consultants in Fredericton.

KEITH PHINNEY

The water treatment, Keith Phinney, Monenco Consultants Limited. The purpose of water treatment process is to remove the minerals that are in the groundwater, this would be similar, in a sense, many of you may have a softener at home, you're removing calcium and magnesium. In this particular case, the water that goes into the turbines has to be extremely pure, it has to be in a sense, to be equivalent to distilled water. So, one is taking out all the minerals. So, as well as calcium and magnesium, we're also taking out sodium, potassium, sulfate and any other trace elements that are in the water. The iron and the manganese are precipitated, they do not go into the Miramichi River, the iron and the manganese form the solids that will collect in the sedimentation pond. This will amount to about a ton of solids per year.

The water that goes into the Miramichi River, will have all of the salts that have been removed from the water, except for bicarbonate plus sodium sulfate. Sodium comes from the caustic soda that's used, the sulfate comes from sulfuric acid that's used. Those are used to regenerate the demineralizer, forming a salt, sodium sulfate. Both of these elements, that is sodium and sulfate, are the same elements that are in sea water. In fact, I believe, sodium and chloride are the highest concentrations in sea

water. So, the elements that are being put back into the Miramichi River, are very consistent with the elements that are already there. And in fact, at most times, the concentration of total dissolved solids in the water, going into the Miramichi River would be less then what's actually in the Miramichi River. So, we predict there is absolutely no affect, of that particular water, going into the Miramichi.

JULIE RICHARD

O.K. excuse me sir.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Just a minute Miss. Richard, are you finished?

BUD BENJAMIN

No I'm not, I have one more Miss. Richard, then I'll let you have this. You said Mr. Meth that there's some units being built at Quebec, at the same time, that they are under construction in Quebec was that my understanding, or going to be constructed?

FRED METH

There not under construction yet.

BUD BENJAMIN

But they are going to be under construction?

FRED METH

That's right.

BUD BENJAMIN

And are we going to be able to buy power from Quebec to supply New Brunswick? The same as there doing, the opposite way.

FRED METH

We have always had those kind of arrangements with Quebec in the past, and we expect them to be available to us. But it always depends, on the on the conditions at a given point in time, the balance between the two systems. I think the answer is yes.

BUD BENJAMIN

O.K. Thank you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

O.K. I'm going to try and take the interveners in the order that they've expressed a request, I think that you were trying to get up.

JULIE RICHARD

Mr. Benjamin, you said you wanted to know about the water. Let's ask Newcastle what inconvenience they went through, last year with the bagged water and how rotten it tasted, because I work in Newcastle and I had to drink it during that time. And people telling me that their whole basement was covered with stacks of water because they had to use that water, that they were being shipped in. And some of them busted in their basement, and some of them were old, and some of the bags weren't clean, when they put the water in, it tasted rotten. And I don't want to get that in Rockcliffe. I don't want any other kind of water, but the water that I'm getting through my well. And I'm sure everybody in Rockcliffe feels the same way and around the surrounding area. Thank you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

There are some gentlemen over here, I think, have you been waiting to speak?

PETER COUSINEAU

My name is Peter Cousineau. The gentleman over here, that said that we had signed a contract, or that N.B. Power had signed a contract with Hydro Quebec, I'd like to know when that contract was signed?

FRED METH

I have a copy of the contract here and the negotiations started last December, the date on this is, if you'll just give me a moment, May 28, 1990.

PETER COUSINEAU

May. You signed the contract, so we signed the people of New Brunswick signed the contract with Hydro Quebec to sell them 400 megawatts of beacon power on May the 28th.

FRED METH

That's correct. It is contingent on successful completion of the EIA and so on, so it has all those...

PETER COUSINEAU

I see. I was just trying to figure out why it was so accelerated because there is penalties involved?

FRED METH

That's correct.

PETER COUSINEAU

O.K. Fred, can you tell me what the reserves are of N.B. Power? If we didn't have these 400 megawatts proposed units, could we fulfil that contract requirement to Hydro Quebec?

FRED METH

We probably couldn't guarantee that we could fulfil it, there would be occasions when we would be able to, but again, I think Doug would be in a better position to answer that than I would.

DOUG BARTLETT

An awful lot of that depends on load growth and so on, but at this point in time we project that we would not be able to fulfil the contract.

PETER COUSINEAU

We couldn't eh?

DOUG BARTLETT

No.

PETER COUSINEAU

O.K. A few minutes ago someone talked about groundwater concentrations and the discharge that was going into the Miramichi River. Can we drink that water that's going into the river? Could we boil our potatoes in that?

KEITH PHINNEY

Yes, Keith Phinney, you could certainly boil your potatoes in it. It would probably leave, as the water evaporated off from your pot, you'd probably find a somewhat thicker scale than you would find from the groundwater that you started with, or from your own water. And in fact that 400 milligrams per total dissolved solids, you could drink that water, you might find it a bit salty you might not like the taste of it.

PETER COUSINEAU

You mean we'd have to dissolve it in a pot or something? Take some more water and put it in and dilute it?

KEITH PHINNEY

No, No, the water that's coming out of that pipeline, based on the quality that we've shown in the report, you could drink it, now you might say that's not palatable, I don't like the taste of it. But you could drink it..

PETER COUSINEAU

It will only cause us to be sick after a period of time.

KEITH PHINNEY

No, no, it's only got salts in it at a higher concentration than what you would find in normal surface water or groundwater, that's the only difference. The concentration of salts has been increased. The only salts that are being added by the water treatment process, which is a very common water treatment process used in many, all over the world really, is sodium, which is, as you know a very common salt, and sulfate which is another common one.

PETER COUSINEAU

That's what the sulfuric acid is for? Is that right?

KEITH PHINNEY

The sulfuric acid and the caustic soda are to regenerate the iron exchanger. Similarly in fashion to which you might regenerate your softener, if you have one, but many people have them in New Brunswick in their basements. They use sodium chloride to regenerate it. Here, we could actually use hydrochloric acid instead of sulfuric which would be in a sense equivalent to using sodium chloride, but, hydrochloric is much more dangerous to work with, so therefore, we use sulfuric acid.

PETER COUSINEAU

Now, obviously there's alot of this water being discharged into the river, a tremendous amount, 13,000 gallons...

KEITH PHINNEY

No, it's not a tremendous amount, in fact, it's about 300 gallons a minute, on average, during the 500 hours operating period.

What is shown in the report are peak flows, it may go up higher, but, on the average it's about 300 gallons a minute. Which is actually a fairly small flow, and certainly compared to the flow in the Miramichi River, as you would recognize, it's absolutely insignificant.

PETER COUSINEAU

That would be 18,000 gallons an hour?

KEITH PHINNEY

It would be 60 times 300. Is that 18,000?

PETER COUSINEAU

That is 18,000, and why don't we just pump that water back into some reservoir, where we can use it for drinking water? Why would we want to pump all that water...

KEITH PHINNEY

Because it's got more salts in it than are desirable for drinking water. It could be used as drinking water, but it certainly has more salts than what one would consider to be desirable for drinking water.

PETER COUSINEAU

But we could live on this water if we had to?

KEITH PHINNEY

Yes, yes I would say you could.

PETER COUSINEAU

Without any side affects.

KEITH PHINNEY

I believe to much sulfate can cause stomach cramps and so on. I don't want to use the word disorder to much.

PETER COUSINEAU

It's a salt, it's salts that are to high?

KEITH PHINNEY

Yes the normal, as you recognize...

PETER COUSINEAU

Like people with heart diseases and so on, is that the same thing?

KEITH PHINNEY

No, let me finish. Well that's right. A person with a heart disease would not drink this water, but nevertheless that person would not go down and drink the Miramichi water or sea water either.

PETER COUSINEAU

Yes I know.

KEITH PHINNEY

O.K.

PETER COUSINEAU

We're just adding it on, we're just adding it into the river.

KEITH PHINNEY

Actually we're putting less, if you will, we're putting less concentration of salts in that water than you would find in the river.

PETER COUSINEAU

O.K. Thank you.

KEITH PHINNEY

O.K.

PETER COUSINEAU

Mr. Meth, what is particulate?

FRED METH

Particulate is, generally speaking, a small proportion of a carbon based fuel which is not completely burned in the process of combustion.

PETER COUSINEAU

Would that be considered ash? Could we call that ash?

FRED METH

No, I believe that ash, usually is the result of the combustion process itself and it's an unburned portion of non-carbon in the fuel, but maybe my distinction there is...

PETER COUSINEAU

I understand it as ash, I always did.

FRED METH

Leo, could you address that for a moment please.

LEO BURNS

In any fuel there is a portion of it that will not be completely combusted during the process. We call that ash. It's a very low amount in oil, it would be somewhere around, I don't know, about .1 per cent, in diesel, it would be much lower than that. In coal it's in a high amount by which you have to have things, as the bag house we have at Chatham and precipitator.

Sometimes, if you looking at particulate as well, it would be coming out the stack, there'd be some of the carbon, a very small amount that may not be combusted and that would also contribute to a particulate.

PETER COUSINEAU

O.K. Thank you. I wanted to point out that when I studied the Millbank report that I came up with a figure of over 2 tons an hour, of pollutants of all types, not just the 1.2 tons, it's over 2 tons. A machine that burns 30,000 plus gallons of diesel fuel an hour, must be one of the largest internal combustion engines in the world, and to generate electricity with an internal combustion engine is to me foolish. We, I'm not from around here, I'm from the Acadian Peninsula where there about to put one of these units in also, in my back yard.

And I wanted to know, if when we take all this moisture and vapour in the air, and when it comes out mixed with the pollutants, if we could breath that, if we could go up on the top of that stack there, could we breath that material coming out of there?

FRED METH

It would be to hot to breath.

PETER COUSINEAU

If we could cool it down then?

FRED METH

I can't really answer that. Maybe, I could ask Dr. Weisman to address this?

PETER COUSINEAU

Are those concentrations coming out of the stack, are they lethal, could I die from breathing that right there, climb up a ladder and go to the top of the stack and breath it?

DR. WEISMAN

I'm not a medical doctor, the actual concentration, as Leo explained, it would be about 300 ppm of SO_2, which is above any threshold that's desirable for breathing, which is around 5 ppm, so you wouldn't want to breath that for any length of time.

PETER COUSINEAU

It would damage me.

FRED METH

I'm not sure where we're going with that question?

PETER COUSINEAU

Well I'm just trying to... There was a man there that said that we were saving money by building this unit, instead of a big unit. There is no saving of money, we either spend it now or pay for it later, one or the other. We get nothing for free. There has to be another method of generating electricity, besides using fossil fuels, its folly, I can't believe it.

Excuse me, I'm going to make a couple of comments now, and then I'm going to go sit down. When I see you people, when I look at you now, I think of you of the most irresponsible people in society today. That's what I see, when I look at you. And I want to say that the government isn't too far behind either.

UNKNOWN

What did you say about the government?

PETER COUSINEAU

I said, I want to say that the government isn't to far behind. These fuel guzzling toilets have no place in society, they have no place in New Brunswick, and they have no place on the planet. The environment is suffering too much. I saw a report yesterday by a Dr. Slater of Environment Canada, and he was on a hot plate by the United States, where there are people, experts, that say that in two generations from now, unless we curb our polluting efforts, our grandchildren will not be able to live on the face of this planet, we will not be able to breath it's air.

And I'm standing here to try and convince the government, this man here, that about 85% of the people in New Brunswick don't want this unit, and unless you listen to it, you become one of the most irresponsible governments in the history. Because in 1990, we simply can not use fossils fuels to generate electricity any longer, they are simply to...forget about cost... think about the pollution that they generate. 50 some tons on a 24 hour basis from this plant, and I don't know how many million of gallons of groundwater. It's crazy, we're using up our resources faster than we can produce them, than nature is producing them.

Fossils fuels are supposed to be, one of the diminishing things on earth, and here we are creating monsters that eat up more fuel then probably a few wells in Alberta could generate, and selling in to our neighbour that's another thing that just...I can't understand that.

In ten years, or twenty years, or thirty years from now our children are going to know things that we do not know, and there going to look at us and say, boy were you guys ever stupid, you know. And you know what the government going to do, there going to point there finger at us and say, you didn't say anything about it, you didn't talk enough, you didn't make enough noise, that's why that's there, and we're here to do that. I think most of the people here, are here to make noise because we're against these machines, we don't want them, and the government should listen to us.

We made a poll this week in the Acadian Peninsula, and we contacted 2000 people by telephone, and 85% of those people said that they did not want that machine in the Acadian Peninsula. That's the result of that poll. We're continuing that poll, we're going to continue doing it, and we're going to find out. If we have to reach out into to Fredericton, and go further and further until we have enough people and enough opinions, then maybe we can do something about it. But this is a start anyway.

There's a verse in the Bible. I wanted to close now. There's a verse in the Bible, I think it's in Revelations, it says that the Lord is returning to destroy those who destroy the earth. And I

think that you guys are the prime candidates for that. Thank you.

ALLISON FURLOTTE

My name is Allison Furlotte and I live on the Lloyd Road. And I just wanted to address my concerns, and I must say that I certainly agree with the former speakers, and also the last speaker from the Acadian Peninsula on his concerns.

There's a few other questions I wanted to bring up. One was in relation to Mrs. Grays' question, regarding the 12 volts of power that she was experiencing in her house every time she touched the sink, or something like that. I wonder maybe, if Fred could talk on this, or could he point out someone to, maybe enlighten us on where this comes from. It's still there, although she had the problem corrected in her own house, but if it's there it's probably someplace else as well, although she probably the closest dwelling to the hydro line.

FRED METH

I must confess, I really can't address that. The first I heard of this was in a newspaper article I saw last week. I think where it was raised for the first time, to my knowledge at least. I have no explanation for that and I wouldn't know where to begin. I think our district office ought to be contacted and we could look into it in that way.

ALLISON FURLOTTE

I would like to see some investigation done on it and of course, if it's happening there, it's probably and straight current and it should be corrected.

FRED METH

It could be a matter of grounding the system.

ALLISON FURLOTTE

I've heard that someone had broken into the terminal plant there and stolen the ground wires, maybe that might have something to do with it. Is that a surprise?

FRED METH

Surprise to me.

ALLISON FURLOTTE

That's where you have no securities. The SO_2 problem certainly amazes me with the amount of SO_2 that's pumped out from the

Millbank. If you add them all up from the Millbank area, the Chatham area, the Acadia Forest Products, and the REPAP mill, we're certainly going to be having alot of SO_2 pumped into our sky and of course what goes up must come down. And the evidence around the province, that you can see with the acid rain, what's happening to our trees. And I think we should be looking to minimize the amount of SO_2 that's pumped out into our environment, rather than adding to it, and probably looking for another source of a generating power than we're now looking at.

FRED METH

If I can comment on that. This is amongst the fossil fuels, this is probably as clean as a fossil fuel as we can get from a sulfur point of view, particulary when they regulated level will be at .05% in 1993. I would like to point out, that in New Brunswick, generally, we're blessed in one way that we're not entirely reliant upon fossil fuels. We do have a very good mix in our system, which includes nuclear and hydro, to about half of the installed capacity and the rest of that is fossil.

ALLISON FURLOTTE

I just wanted to add to the other gentleman's question, why there is not more monitoring stations? You had mentioned there was going to be one, perhaps, and I've always thought myself there should be at least four where these fall outs could be monitored. But I guess you've already answered that question, there's going to be one.

The other thing I had, now that the plant is in a new location, I think our concerns from the Lloyd Road and the McHardy Road people becomes a little more evident. And although there's been alot of attention and not enough certainly with the Rockcliffe subdivision, we've never had anyone visit our homes to do an evaluation, or test our water, or a I guess talk to anyone regarding the problems that we may have down the road a little ways.

FRED METH

Part of the agreement that I was talking about earlier, that we're drafting to basically extend this groundwater guarantee, will include testing and getting all of the various parameters of the individuals systems on a home by home basis.

ALLISON FURLOTTE

O.K., one other thing I had, there now doing some repair on the McHardy Road. And a due to the tremendous traffic that's going to be there, in the near future, with the hauling of the fuel by the way of ten truck loads a day, I understand. That road is used

by the residents there, it's a very narrow road, I don't see no evidence of them making it wider to accommodate for those large trucks, other then preparing the chipseal it and leaving about 15 meters not chipsealed to extend up to where the pave ends at the other end. Could you answer this, why this road is not a bit wider to perhaps minimize the dangers of passing the local traffic that now uses that road?

UNKNOWN

We have been in contact of course, with the Department of Highways, and they are working at upgrading that road. We can take that concern to the Department of Highways to check on the widths and so on, but it will be upgraded to better standards. I'm not sure of the exact width, so I would have to refer that to the Department of Highways.

ALLISON FURLOTTE

Well the ditch as been freshly cleaned out, so I would take it that's as wide as it's going to be, and that's the old original path that's there, just for the common traffic which was light vehicles and we should get after them right away before they start chip sealing or whatever there going to do to that road.

In closing I certainly want to say that I agree with the concerns that were brought up here tonight, and some very serious thought should be placed on the ideas that we have where this plant should be. Maybe we can sell it to Quebec, I don't know. So in closing I want to thank you for listening to me, thank you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Excuse me, I have a couple of people waiting over here, do you still have a question Mr. Richard.

BURT RICHARD

This goes back to my concern about an unmanned plant. Maybe this gentleman could tell me, how much caustic and how much sulfuric acid is going to be stored on sight for this demineriliz er thing?

UNKNOWN

Because of the small amounts that will be used per year, you could actually store the whole years supply on the site. Now normally, and that would probably be the safest way, because that just means one or two truck loads per year. In other words to bring those numbers of barrels of sulfuric caustic and bags of potassium permanganate that are needed to be held on site. Normally there might be one or two months supply kept on site, in

other large plants, in this particular case one could keep up to a year. I'm not sure what N.B. Power is planning with respect to chemical storage. Does that answer your question?

BURT RICHARD

Not completely, I was looking for the size of the tanks and such, that the sulfuric and caustic would be held in.

UNKNOWN

Normally one could get it in barrels, 55 gallons this type of thing. You've possibly seen them, there is a larger package, I don't believe they'll be getting in tanker truck loads, in other words, there won't be storage tanks on site, they'll be getting it in some sort of a carboy a large carboy or a barrel type. For example, one would only need ten 55 gallons drums of caustic soda per year, need about 35 barrels of sulfuric acid per year, and possibly 15 - 25 kilogram bags of potassium permanganate per year. So you can see is a this would fill up a storage space sort of here over to something like this, so it's not very much. Each of these would be kept in a segregated area, and there would be a curbed area, any spills would be picked up and so on.

ALLISON FURLOTTE

What would be the concentration of these chemicals, or are they stored, let's say 50% concentration for caustic, and 98% for sulfuric?

UNKNOWN

If we keep this up, you and I could do a duet. Normally the caustic is usually received at 50 weight percent concentration, sulfuric acid is 93 or so per cent, and potassium permanganate is pretty well 100%, it comes as a purple fine crystal in a plastic lined bag.

BURT RICHARD

What would be the affect of spilling one barrel of this caustic into the river, what would be the affect of the Ph level? I mean the affect at the outlet of the pipe line?

UNKNOWN

Well, first of all the only way to spill it into the river would be to carry a barrel down there, and dump it into the river. It would cause PH, caustic soda, would cause a drastic PH increase at the point you dumped it in, it would dissipate very quickly because you would be putting a barrel into a tremendous amount of

water. But certainly you'd have to carry a barrel, there's no way that a barrel of caustic or any other chemicals could get into the pipeline that's carrying the spent regenerate down to the Miramichi River. The only place it could spill would be if someone were taking it off a truck or inside the plant, in which case things would be curbed and the spills would be picked up, neutralized if necessary such that you end with a salty liquid, then you would be able to put that down to the pipeline cause you'd end up just having a salty solution.

It should be also noted that these sort of chemicals are carted throughout North America, throughout the world, throughout New Brunswick everyday of the week. I've worked, we worked at many different plants, of many different institutions, you say you've worked in institutions, you probably know this and there used in tanker loads, there a very common chemicals, they have to be handled very carefully. In this particular case, in this particular plant, there using a relatively small quantity because of the purity of the groundwater that is being treated, the minerals being removed also because of the fact the plants only scheduled to run 500 hours of the year 500 hours per year.

BURT RICHARD

I guess this is my concern...

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Mr. Richard, could you wrap up with one more question, we have about three other people who are waiting.

BURT RICHARD

No, this answers my concern. I was just concerned about the quantities stored on site, because especially with unmanned plants, if you had a valve failure or something you'd could possibly get out on the river if you were talking tanker loads or whatever but your talking just a separate barrels apparently.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Right here on the right.

ERNEST GALLANT

My name is Ernest Gallant. I'm from the Millbank, Rockcliffe Subdivision. I did some calculations, I'm not sure what it means but, my impression is that decided a plant as Mr. Benjamin said is quite large. If you take a consideration from that plant alone in one hour, in New Brunswick, it would do about 13% of the carbon dioxide emission in New Brunswick, that plant alone in one hour. If you take for 500 hours for the year, it's about .7% of the

emission of carbon dioxide in New Brunswick. Now if that is carbon dioxide, I don't know about the other elements you have consider, we're talking about the sulfur oxide contamination, I am not sure that the fossil fuel has only that contamination into it when it is burnt. And I am not sure how efficient it is burnt, to neutralize the contaminant.

One other thing I would like to bring up, we're talking about norms in New Brunswick, I think the question we should not be asking, what New Brunswick norms are respecting, but what are the level of the New Brunswick norms compared to other jurisdictions. .....are ecologically sensitive.....

One other thing I would like to ask is, we're talking about the water table, it's been brought up several times. We have said, I have heard said, if I understand right, that we're thinking of guaranteeing of water supply. My question is not guaranteeing the water supply as such, but guaranteeing the free excess of quantity and quality of water. Now, like they have showers, no problem, the kids can recreate in the water, no problem. I can sprinkle my garden with no problem, irrigate my garden. Are we saying the Power Commission would pipe the water to give us that quality and quantity of water. Are we saying that, if we're saying that maybe we are addressing one other question and concern we have. But if we are trucking it in, I haven't seen to many people take showers in trucked water.

There's another question, what is the affect on the Ozone. What affect will that have, that magnitude of when we're considering a high percentage of contamination bringing in the atmosphere, what affect will it have on the Ozone? I'm not just talking one part, I'm talking affect we have now, how much will it add? We're talking about, we're saying that the contamination is minimum, I'm willing to buy that for an hour, two hour but I'm looking into the contamination we already have in the area, the natural soil contamination and what this will add on and what affect will that have on a sensitive living ecological system, not just a place I can sweep up. That's what I'm worried about.

FRED METH

Your last point has been discussed at some length in the document itself.

ERNEST GALLANT

I'm sorry?

FRED METH

I say the last point has been discussed at considerable length in the document itself, there will be no affect.

ERNEST GALLANT

What norms are they using to base themselves on, the present New Brunswick norms?

FRED METH

What we're using are known concentrations, at which sensitive species are affected by these types of depositions.

ERNEST GALLANT

Have we got, in North America, a similar plant as we're proposing here that's using similar fuel with an ecological study of the impact of let's see 10 years period, 20 years period?

FRED METH

Well, we don't really need to have an exactly identical situation. What we need to know is, what is coming out of the stack from burning the fuel we propose to burn there. And those numbers that affect certain types of sensitive crops, if you will, or sensitive species in ecosystems, those numbers are known. And the levels that are being modeled from this plant are not anywhere approaching the levels that cause these kinds of adverse affects, so I repeat to you that there would be no affect.

ERNEST GALLANT

One question I would like to ask, it may not have to do with that directly tonight. Is Quebec promises known to be very sensitive to the ecological problem, especially the hydro, it wants it image to be squeaky clean. How come, economically, it would not have done this plant if it's buying it from contract here, we're paying the plant here, it would of been cheaper for them to do that. How come their buying it from us out of contract?

FRED METH

Doug could I ask you to respond to that question.

DOUG BARTLETT

I believe that would require a response from Hydro Quebec and I can't speak on their behave so...

ERNEST GALLANT

Excuse me, I hope don't have a ..... contract? Good Night.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

I'm just curious if you could answer, your mentioning of the combustion, same type of plant as planned in Quebec, I would assume it would be fuelled with natural gas, so you can't compare the two. I mean your looking at completely different fuel sources and natural gas is certainly a heck of a lot cleaner than diesel fuel, diesel fuel is certainly not the cleanest fossil fuel going.

FRED METH

There is a concept around that natural gas is very much cleaner on some of these contaminants than is diesel fuel, or other oil fuels. Leo could I ask you to address that.

LEO BURNS

Well, when your looking at the different types of fuels and your saying which is cleaner and whatever, there are coals and different grades of coals, there are oils and different grades of oils, and you get down to wood and natural gas and diesel the fact remains that if we had natural gas, here in the province, and if we had the ability burn it, it would be slightly, the emissions would be slightly less than those associated with burning diesel. But people equate emissions with pollution or deposition and that's not the fact, in this case here, and in the modelling and in the studying it clearly shows that, while people feel the emissions are high they are not contributing to impact either through ground level concentrations of air quality contaminants or if your looking at sulphate deposition and people are concerned about acid rain. For instance the back ground here, in this province in this area now, is around 12.9 kilograms of what sulphate per hector per year.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

Up to 15 though.

LEO BURNS

It varies.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

14 is the maximum.

LEO BURNS

That's right. And as you understand that, if you have a high rainfall rate it depends on the concentration in the rain, if in one year you get a lot of rain your deposition is going to be higher the next year if you get a little bit less it's going to be lower. The concentrations tend to be going down and the deposition

tends to be going down, the plant itself, I believe that we looked at the greatest impact from the plant and it comes out to 0.01 kilograms of wet sulphate per hector per year, while we rounded that off to 0.01 because its actually less than that. So if you multiply that by 4 to get up to 2000 hours we say its .02 or 0.02 so if you were looking at 12.9 kilograms if you add that for 500 hours it comes out to 12.91 really its a...

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

But I don't think that that's the point...

LEO BURNS

I understand that...

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

I'm not sure that we read the same report here, you mentioned earlier that the major concern in terms of pollution controls are environmental controls, was ground level depositions of SO_2, and the fact remains and it's stated quite clearly in this report that with the addition of the Millbank thermal generating station that we're going to be exceeding the provincial levels.

LEO BURNS

Perhaps I could address that, I believe that first of all with respect to the Millbank plant there will be no exceedences of any standards.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

But we have to look at it...

LEO BURNS

If you look at. Excuse me, if I may finish, if you don't mind, it does look at other sources in the area, not in the Millbank area, it does show that those other sources do not exceed most of the standards, except for one particular standard which is the 24 hour SO_2 standard, and it shows that existing emissions from existing sources modelling shows that in 12 hours over 40 some thousand hours, 12 hours out of 5 year,s there is potential to have the 24 hour SO_2 standard exceeded. The report also clearly states that at that point, at that location where that standard is exceeded there is no impact from the Millbank plant.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

But, the fact remains, the standard was established, the standard exists, the standard is law. When you add the Millbank

power generating plant, the fact also remains that the other industries do exist here, and that the other emissions do take place, and when we add the additional one we are going to exceed the standards. Now the only way not to exceed the standards is not to add the extra plant.

LEO BURNS

If I may clarify that, I would like to re-emphasize that at the location where that one particular standard was forecast to be exceeded, there is no impact, there is no contribution from the Millbank plant.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

I could say the same thing, when I'm speeding along and I'm going 65 mph and the policeman stops me and I say that extra 10 mph doesn't affect anything. But I'm still breaking the law, I'm still fined. There's no difference here, we don't exceed the regulations just because we decide that there not going to have a harmful affect. When I read this report there were a number of ecosystems that were identified as being in danger from the additional emissions from this plant.

FRED METH

That is not the case. Could I ask Dr. Weisman please to address this.

BORIS WEISMAN

I think Leo stated that already, but, the combined impact of all sources that your reading there, even if Millbank is not built, in other words, right now the combined impact of the existing SO_2 sources exceeds the 900 standard, on certain occasions.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

So we're going to add to that. I mean this is absolutely insane.

BORIS WEISMAN

What I'm saying to you is that, it's not the addition of this source that's doing it.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

O.K. but we're going to add to it though.

BORIS WEISMAN

Well, that's a totally.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

That's incredible logic.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Could I have order please, continue.

FRED METH

The answer is no, we're not adding to that, and that was clearly demonstrated by the modelling.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

O.K., so we have absolutely no SO_2 emissions coming out of that plant?

FRED METH

That's not what we said. We said that the emissions from this plant will not add to the exceedences where they are presently taking place.

LIANE THIBODEAU-DOUCET

O.K. so you add 1 and 1 and it doesn't make 2. I mean that's what your basically saying.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Continue..... One moment please.

BORIS WEISMAN

If I could add to that, the assumption seems to be that the builders of power plants are the ones who are causing all the pollution, but it's the people who are using the power. Now does anybody stop from buying a second car, because that contributes to NOx and ozone. You have to stop and think of what it is that's driving the building of new plants, it's use of electricity and you have to realize you have to build it somehow.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

The gentlemen in the third row is next I believe.

MIKE DOYLE

Madame Chairlady, my name is Mike Doyle ,I'm from Nelson Miramichi. I was going to ask the proponents a couple of questions regarding transmission easements. However, after reflecting a bit more on this ludicrous proposal, and considering their past practice, I firmly believe that the proponents simply don't give a dam. So, the only comment I wish to make at this time, is relative to the fact that until proven otherwise, N.B. Power is the largest polluter in New Brunswick. And right now they need an image boost and I can't think of a better way to enhance their image than to call their friends in Quebec and respectfully suggest that they generate their own electricity. Thank you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

O.K. question over on the right. I think this lady was waiting.

SHIRLEY GALLANT

My name is Shirley Gallant and I live in Rockcliffe subdivision. I would just like to add my comments to comments that already have been made. My background is in nursing and my main concern is health, and I'm very concerned about the emissions from this plant. I don't really understand the logic that was just used here a few minutes ago. In my estimation, there was no logic in what was being said, you seem to be saying that the added emissions from the plant were really going to do nothing extra to our environment because we already were above the provincial standards so it didn't really matter what else we added to it, if your above it your above it. But that doesn't make much sense when it comes to our health.

I moved to the Millbank subdivision in order to live outside of town and away from emissions as much as possible. I lived for a while, in Douglastown, when our children were young, and directly across the river from the Chatham Head chipboard plant. Our children were very frequently ill with upper respiratory track infections, and to a point where our family doctor asked me where we lived, and when I told him, his comment was, well there are a lot of children from that area who are very ill with upper respiratory track infections, and he seemed to think it had something to do with the emissions coming from that plant.

Two years later, we moved to Millbank and from then on our children were very, very infrequently ill with upper respiratory track infections, so I had to assume that there was a connection. I also, we also like to plant a very big garden in our back yard and we like to think that it is chemically free. We use compost, we use no chemicals at all on our gardens, we use no pesticides, no herbicides its totally chemically free. Now, I am not going to

feel very safe when that plant is in my back yard, in my subdivision. They're already many hazards in our environment and our world around us and I don't think we should be adding to these and that's why I feel that, that logic that was used a while ago just doesn't make any sense.

The emissions from this plant are very scary to me and I find myself directly in line with most of it. New Brunswick power has offered to buy six houses in the subdivision and we are directly across the main road from all of these houses and no one has offered to buy our house. Again the water in our area, you are guaranteeing that you will truck in the water, but as my husband has already commented how many of us, you know, are going to take a bath in trucked in water, that doesn't make very sense either. You can not really guarantee us the quality and quantity of water that we have now.

My final comment is that I do not want this plant in our back yard, and I would really wish that you would take our concerns into consideration. I feel it is a fait accompli, I hope it isn't.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Did you have a question, Sir?

BEN BALDWIN

My name is Ben Baldwin of the Miramichi Environmental Society. This is a rare occasion when we have apparently and obviously so many distinguished guests, in the audience who have not been introduced to us, but I'm sure represent a great variety of expertise and it's a rare privilege that we have that we can get some maybe distinct answers to some very specific questions, for example these questions I'm going to ask are very few and I won't take much of your time, and the relevance will be obvious when I'm through.

But the first question I would like to ask, is, are detailed chemical analysis done on your test fuels that are used in the Chatham generating plant? And if so, what is the chemical composition of the Petroleum Coke which has recently been burned there as I understand, could you appoint somebody to answer that question please?

FRED METH

Leo Burns of N.B. Power.

LEO BURNS

There is a term under the Air Quality approval for the Chatham plant, that any fuels that are burned in addition to the normal

coal, New Brunswick coal and the wood chips or the wood now, that we have to get permission from the Dept. of Environment and part of that is to register the characteristics of the fuel, so the Petroleum Coke that's there, that I believe came last fall, the fuel characteristics of that were included.

BEN BALDWIN

I'm sorry but you didn't answer my question. What is the chemical composition, for example, what is the chemical composition of arsenic in that material, or lead which are two elements I'd expect to find in it.

LEO BURNS

I'm not sure exactly, which elements were there but the chemical composition, the characteristics I was speaking of did contain the higher elements that you would expect to find in that.

BEN BALDWIN

Surely there is somebody here tonight, amongst you experts who can answer that very simple question. What is the percentage or parts per million arsenic and lead in the Petroleum Coke burned in Chatham, because I think its very relevant to what we're talking, and I'll make my point in a minute or so.

LEO BURNS

I don't mean to be facetious, but we all drink milk and I'm not sure we all know what the chemical composition of milk is.

BEN BALDWIN

I didn't come here to be insulted tonight, and I don't think 50 percent of the people here came to be insulted either. I know for a fact that there is arsenic and lead in that material that your burning in Chatham.

LEO BURNS

No, I apologize if you felt I insulted you, I guess all I'm saying is that we have diesel fuels and liquid fuels, and quite frankly I don't know, to the nearest parts per million or so what those elements would be. In all fossil fuels, and in most material, if you look to the nearest sensitivity of the instrument you can probably find traces of most of the elements.

BEN BALDWIN

I know all of those things, however, I still have not got a direct answer to a direct question of how much of those toxic

elements are in that, and I would expect to find them both and when I did an analysis I did find them both. And I would suspect that if you folks didn't know what's in it, I would expect the people from the Dept. of Environment here would know. And I'm astonished that nobody here knows what is in this material, that you import from the United States, or God knows where else in the world, you burn here in a test facilities and you don't even know what's in it. And those fumes go in, there's a particulate scrubber maybe on that, but, there's no gas scrubbers, I understand it, and we live here, and you don't live here, I understand.

LEO BURNS

I guess you raise two points, as I said before we do have the analysis of that fuel, and I unfortunately don't know exactly what it is now, but with respect again, as you realize, the Chatham plant was designed to be a state of art plant and emissions from sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide....

BEN BALDWIN

I don't care if it's a state of the art plant, we don't know what the fuel is your burning there, in a test capacity. You don't know what the fuel is.

LEO BURNS

And also the particular emissions are down to the standards, any concerns of the elements your speaking of would be in the order of anagrams or peakagrams or whatever. Ah I can be fairly confident about that.

BEN BALDWIN

Well I could tell there aren't anagrams or peakagrams they are parts per million, and it's in arsenic and lead both of which I understand to go into the air.

LEO BURNS

I guess again, what I'm talking about, what would be deposited in the area, would be in orders of anagrams or peakagrams per cubic meter.

BEN BALDWIN

O.K. if you can't answer a very simple question, I'll give you even a simpler question. What is the percentage of sulfur in the coal in the little field that you intend to mine near Beresford, New Brunswick? And I understand also, that your going to burn that in a plant in New Brunswick, what's the percentage of sulfur in

that in that coal? And don't tell me there's nobody here that knows that number.

FRED METH

I'm not sure what the relevance of that is, but I'll try and...

BEN BALDWIN

Well I'll tell you in one minute...

FRED METH

Well, let me answer if you don't mind, you've asked me a question, I would like very much the opportunity to answer it. The only analysis that I have seen have been in the range of, similar to the Grand Lake Field and in some cases a bit higher.

BEN BALDWIN

Well I can tell you, I'm astonished again that none of you people know, and I don't believe it for a minute, it ranges from 7 to 8 percent sulfur and that makes it the highest thermal coal burned anywhere in the world, as far as I know. And I used to work in the coal business. The relevance of these questions is that, if you are not more concerned about the environment, and you don't know, in lacking those answers to those questions God help us from the Millbank station.

FRED METH

I think I answered your question.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

O.K. we have a question over here on this microphone.

JOHN HUBBARD

Yes, John Hubbard from Rockcliffe subdivision. Ah I was just wondering, I have a couple of questions for Fred. 628 tons of SO_2 are you telling us there is no way to cut that down, that's the impression you gave me, that was it, there's no way to get in any lower?

FRED METH

Not at all, that was the number based on the highest allowable level in diesel fuel in Canada today, and that's the same for New Brunswick as for Canada.

JOHN HUBBARD

You can't do anything, like put scrubbers or do anything else to put that any lower.

FRED METH

No that will be,probably from a practical perspective if it's going to be about half of that level for starters.

JOHN HUBBARD

O.K. Lets say 300 tons is their anything else you can do to make that lower?

FRED METH

Well in two years, the scrubbing as I said is being done at the front end of this process at the refinery.

JOHN HUBBARD

So, if it were scrubbed it at the other end would it make it lower? I don't care if it's one percent lower, would it make it lower, that's all I'm asking, I want a simple yes or no.

FRED METH

I don't have the technical answer as to whether, at that very low level that's coming out of there, whether you could reduce that further with a scrubber, with the normal conventional scrubber that we're using at Belledune for example.

JOHN HUBBARD

The reference I made to, like, this plant is running 500 hours the year if Miramichi Pulp and Paper runs 500 hours year, this plant would put out 4 times the amount of SO_2. If you could take your figures, the mill runs 360 days a year, is this not right, so if the mill run 500 hours, would this plant not put out 4 times as much SO_2?

FRED METH

I don't have the numbers in my head so I can't answer that...

JOHN HUBBARD

Well, if you just add them up...

FRED METH

I'm not sure where your going with that one...

JOHN HUBBARD

Well I'm just saying that if your making mills have standards and they've got to cut back, are you going to make a mill run 500 hours so it can put out the same SO_2 as you, is that the only way you can cut down the SO_2 emissions?

FRED METH

No, I think I indicated in 1993, the SO_2, or the sulfur level in fuel will be cut to 1/10 of what it is today.

JOHN HUBBARD

So there's no, oh that's alright....

Next question, say in February 1992, I turn on the tap and there's no water in my house, and I call N.B. Power, and I get a plumber and he says my well is dry, what happens the next day? O.K. well the next day, like I want you to tell me, I've been asking you for six Jesus months what your going to do? If my well goes dry, and you say I'm going to guarantee your water, so in February '92, my well goes dry what in the hell are you going to do?

FRED METH

We will have a complete program in place in that eventuality.

JOHN HUBBARD

No, I mean what are you, what, are you going to get this plant approved, then you're going go and tell me what your going to do with my water. Tell me what your going to do before you get it approved.

FRED METH

I think...

JOHN HUBBARD

Well, this in not answering the question, your going to have a plan, but, my well is dry and what's going to happen the next day in February when it's the middle of winter, are you going to put a truck out in my yard so the pipe...

FRED METH

I think I mentioned earlier that we were developing a detailed plan which you will receive.

JOHN HUBBARD

After the plant is approved or before? Can you tell me that you will have that before the plant is approved?

FRED METH

I can tell you, that we'll make you the guarantee...

JOHN HUBBARD

What...No.

FRED METH

We'll get it to you as soon as we can, I can't...

JOHN HUBBARD

No, but before cabinet approves this plant, will you guarantee that we'll know how our water supplies going to be guaranteed? And what's going to happen in February when my well goes dry, the next day? That's all I'm asking, yes or no, Fred?

FRED METH

We'll get you this agreement as soon as we have it ready that's the best I can tell you right now.

JULIE MATCHETT

How much red tape are we going to get when we call and say our water is run out?

FRED METH

I hope none.

JULIE MATCHETT

Hope not, when I tell my children you can not have this, it means I they can't have it. And when I say they're going to get it, they receive it. Your not going to bullshit us, into telling us your going to get it, but when? I don't promise my kids and don't deliver.

FRED METH

We're not promising you anything that we can't deliver.

JULIE MATCHETT

You promised us that if our water runs dry because of this plant, that you are going to make sure that we get water. We don't want water, the next day, we want water a couple of hours later maybe we might stand for that. If we're patient enough, and not only that I mean I'm not to patient here tonight, like I told you awhile ago, I have asthma problems and the smoke in this area and ah cologne from all the men around here is affecting me as it is. I had to pop a pill awhile ago. When I want water I'd like to have it in my house, not delivered by a God dam truck or a couple of bags, like they had in Newcastle.

FRED METH

We'll try to assure you, in every way that we can, that you will have that.

JULIE MATCHETT

The government or N.B. Power?

FRED METH

N.B. Power. You'll have a 24 hour phone number that...

JULIE MATCHETT

O.K. when the power goes out, how many phone call do you receive telling you that the power is out in a certain area?

FRED METH

Well, we first of all get one and that alerts us and they come quite quickly after that.

JULIE MATCHETT

And then it was just like this winter gone by, it was at least six hours pretty near before we got power. Then you had to pay overtime, I presume, and you didn't want to pay that. All cutting back, always cutting back, and we suffer for it.

FRED METH

One benefit of having that plant here is that, maybe when we

have an outage we'll get on line faster.

JULIE MATCHETT

Oh really...

ANGELA BIRDSELL

O.K. if you have something to say, the proper procedure is to approach the microphone and state your name, Sir.

HARRY GALLANT

My name is Harry Gallant, and I'm just, I can understand everybody's concerns here this evening. But my main concern, if your going to build this plant here in Millbank and also they're looking at maybe building another plant down the Acadian Peninsula and maybe somewhere else in the province. But lately there's been a few concerns with regards to maybe another nuclear plant built at Point Lepreau, and my question is first is there anymore development on that plant or do you people know anything more about it, and if so, if that plant is built at Point Lepreau is it necessary that these other plants be built throughout the province?

FRED METH

Well, the simple answer is I don't think the two are related. Point Lepreau is what is called a base load plant, which when you have it is running all the time, it's not one that you sort of move up and down in your system to respond to a particular peak, this is a peaking plant so the use of the plant is entirely different so building one does not replace the other.

HARRY GALLANT

Another thing tonight, I was listening to the news and they were talking about the generating plants, probably six or eight of them across the province and being the main contributor to SO_2 and acid rain. Mr. Mulroney and a lot of the other people here in Canada are trying to reduce, a lot of this emissions into the air, and what not, across the province and I realize that maybe this plant is only going to contribute a minimal amount.

I think that the people here have a dam good concern, although I think that you people as being N.B. Power officials, also have a good concern as to build these plants. It would be different, maybe, if it was going to employ maybe fifty or a hundred people. I'm sure we wouldn't see it here on the Miramichi, it would be in Saint John, or maybe Fredericton, or somewhere else. But I just hope with your background and your technology and all your expertise you don't try to dump something on us in the North

Eastern part, as to say well, we'll give it to these people because they don't know and different. I think there's a lot of people here that are really concerned about this, and like I say, with you people with the expertise you have, I think you should sit back and consider it. We're not only looking at today, we're looking at our own children and our own children's children that are going to be trying to operate this country down the road, and I don't think there's going to be a Hell of a lot left to it, when they get around to it, Thank you.

PETER COUSINEAU

I wanted to ask a question, why N.B. Power went into these two area Millbank and Saint Rose, and offered people inflated prices for their land? Months ago. I want to know that, you caused a lot of trouble up my way boy?

UNKNOWN

The experts not here.

PETER COUSINEAU

He took off. You know you came into my area, like thieves in the night, and you offered four times more money than the land was worth to those people, and you made their heads spin, and you caused problems up there, real problems, people have threatened me. And that's just like gangsters to me, what you've done there. You've ruined friends, we were friends for years, and you've went in there and offered 70,000, 60,000 dollars for pieces of land that are not worth 15,0000 dollars. What kind of people are you anyway, your just like gangsters.

The irony of it is that we pay the salaries.

UNKNOWN

Yeah, correct.

PAUL WHALEN

I'm not going to bite. I'd to congratulate the 30 or more a...

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Excuse me could you just state your name.

PAUL WHALEN

I'm sorry, Paul Whalen, I have parents who live in this area, I have been staying there a lot myself working. As I was saying,

I was hoping to address this to the member of the Environment representing us here at the table. I would also like to congratulate the large turn out from Millbank, I understand the last meeting didn't have as many. I would say it's one to one here. I've been following the objections in the newspapers, and on a lighter note, I've also read in the same newspapers, a smaller article the size of an advertisement, that mentioned the Netherlands are generating 3000 megawatts annually by the use of windmills. And the only objection by the people was that the windmills were an eyesore to the landscape. That's not that bad of a price to pay. So with the understanding that the peoples objections to this are being addressed, perhaps you might appease them even further by giving them information on the research that has been done, in the past, by you people regarding windmills and the power that is capable by this means. I don't believe in your report there was ever any mention of that sort of alternative Thank you.

UNKNOWN

I understand that a project had initially an idea of 500 hours output per year, now how soon do you expect to increase that to 2000 projected 2400 hours a year?

FRED METH

We don't expect to increase that.

UNKNOWN

I'm sorry.

FRED METH

We do not expect to increase that, that is the expected operation of that plant.

UNKNOWN

But you have a projection for that though?

FRED METH

No, we do not have a projection for that, we've been told by Hydro Quebec that they will call on this up to 500 hours per year, what we have, you may be referring to in the atmospheric modelling that was done was a sensitivity analysis, of the level of deposition resulting from running the plant for 2000 hours a year, as a basically as a method of comparison with the 500, and what that did for us from the modelling point of view was to put all of the 500 hours into one quarter of the year which is most likely the winter season when this plant would be expected to operate.

UNKNOWN

I understand you have a contract. In that contract it must be stipulated how much you are projecting to do a year. Could we have the number of that?

FRED METH

I don't have that contract, do we have that number Doug, I don't believe that there is a number specified, there's an expected operation is that....

DOUG BARTLETT

No, the 500 hours given to us by Hydro Quebec was an expectation by them, you're correct, in how often during the year they would call upon this contract, there is no limitation on that in the contract per say. This is a typical operation for peaking type units. Why you would build a peaking type unit, rather than an intermediate load or a base load unit, is because they operate very little, the fuel costs are very very high compared to other options, so typically they will not operate more than a 5 percent capacity fact or so, which is in the 500 hour a year range.

UNKNOWN

O.K. but you do expect to do over 500 hours a year?

DOUG BARTLETT

Sorry.

UNKNOWN

You do expect to generate for over 500 hours a year?

DOUG BARTLETT

Hydro Quebec have told us that they expect the operation to be in the range of 500 hours a year, that's correct.

UNKNOWN

And how much over? What's you're limit over?

DOUG BARTLETT

There is no limitation in the contract per say.

UNKNOWN

Because that would make a big difference on the environment, if you got 500 hours, that project there 500 hours looks at everything quoted tonight was on the premises of 500 hours working a year.

DOUG BARTLETT

That's correct.

UNKNOWN

Just about. And if you multiply that by four or five it would make a big difference.

DOUG BARTLETT

As Fred mentioned, there was a sensitivity done, just to ensure what the levels might be at 2000 unless, I can't comment on that.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Are there further comments or questions?

HARRY GALLANT

My name is Harry Gallant, I was just like to say one thing. I realize that you people have a strategic job ahead, in order to come here and listen to these people concerns, and it's good that you were able to do that. And the way the system is set up, at least it gives everybody's point of view, as to what is going on and not something that's pulled over their eyes, so I would just like more or less to congratulate you people on some of the work that your doing, because I know you get a lot of criticism throughout the time, and I think probably most of the people behind me here sympathize with you to that respect. And I just hope that sometime down the road, that you just don't sit back in a corner and you know, kind of shelve it, sit down and seriously think about what your actually doing and not only here in Millbank but throughout the rest of the province. Thank you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Thank you.

JULIE MATCHETT

Julie Matchett. Mr. Gallant, I would like to inform you probably, that these men are here and they are paid to be here.

We're here freely and we're here to fight for our rights. Thank you.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Thank you I certainly...

BUD BENJAMIN

Maybe if I could draw a conclusion here, I'd just like to thank the people here on behalf of the citizens of Millbank, as you know Jack is not here, and a I would just like to thank you for attending this meeting. And I would also like to thank you people, who are here for endeavouring to answer our questions. And I just ask that when you are making this decision, when you people are making this decision, to give to the provincial cabinet, put yourselves in the position of that plant being within 5 or 6 hundred meters of your home and of your children and of your water, put yourselves in that position, and you are Christian people pray about it. Thank you very much and good night.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

Before I close I'm going to ask our representatives from the Dept of Environment who will briefly sum up the EIA process. Just approach the microphone please.

ROSEMARY CINCUREK

I'm Rosemary Cincurek from Little Bartibog. During the discussion this evening we've been talking a lot about the emissions, what's going to happen what's not going to happen. Ah recently we returned from Ontario and flying over southern Ontario we saw many smoke stacks. Now it's my opinion, and I said to my husband at that time, anybody that ever tries to tell us that if they have a smoke stack so many feet, so many big and it burns such and such is not going to hurt us is feeding us a bunch of bologna because when your up there you see how small and unimportant we are in the grand plan of things and if...

....it is a thing you've decided, you've made up your mind, I don't know why you waste your time and our tax dollars paying you to come down here for something that probably is already decided. The expertise in this room, as you've said, the've had experts all over the world in medicine, in the environment, and they have fallen flat on their face, things backfire, and we are going in the wrong direction all over the place. We're just a small part here but we're not doing the world any good at all and I think the concerns here should be looked at. And its been our experience with things that have happened on the Miramichi, I don't know what or how we have to get across to the people in power, that they

should really consult us before they go ahead and do all these things and contract out. And I'm like everybody else, I think if Quebec wants it, let them build their own. And if it is for us, well we'll look at some other way of doing it. Thank you.

CARY CASEY

Cary Casey, I'm resident of Rockcliffe subdivision. I've read this here, and if I had a dollar for every time I've read is anticipated, is not anticipated, is expected, is not expected, there's just too many uncertainties in there. If I had a dollar, I could buy everybody here a drink for every time I've read that in there tonight. But anyway, seeing you all here, environment people, Department of Environment, New Brunswick. When they first announced this plant, Vaughn Blaney, I believe was on News Scope, and he stated that the people would be the ones to ultimately decide about environmental issues in the Province of New Brunswick. And I hope the Department of the Environment are going to listen to the people of Millbank that are here tonight and all the other people on the Miramichi.

Summing up the gentleman from St. George, not in my backyard, not in anybody backyard.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

O.K. I'm going to close the question period now and I'm just going to ask for some final comments from this end of the table.

NANCY WHITE

First of all, I'd would like to thank you all for coming and being part of this process, and I think Mr. Casey raised a good point there. Mr. Blaney will receive a verbatim transcript of this meeting, as well as a summary of the public participation and the whole process, and that represents part of the package that he will receive in order to make his decision. It is very important to point out, at this time, that the decision has not been made, and that your comments will be taken into account in the decision whether to approve this plant. It's not a foregone conclusion, it's not a fait accompli, Mr. Blaney has not made the decision, he has not made his recommendation to Cabinet, that will come after the fifteen day period that you have to submit your written comments to the Minister. Thank you very much for coming.

ANGELA BIRDSELL

I guess I was going to say the same comments, and I don't have to now, so, I will officially close this meeting. Thank you all for coming.